REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 797 24 EA 000 836

THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTER.
BY- MINER, JOHN B.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0217-22 PUB DATE JUL 67
CONTRACT OEC-4-10-163
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.08 100P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SUPERVISORS, HIGH SCHOOL SUPERVISORS, PRINCIPALS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, HIGH SCHOOLS, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, JOB ANALYSIS, MOTIVATION, RATING SCALES, ADMINISTRATOR CHARACTERISTICS, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, *ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION, *ADMINISTRATOR SELECTION, *ADMINISTRATOR QUALIFICATIONS, EUGENE,

TO DETERMINE MAJOR FACTORS AFFECTING SELECTION AND PERFORMANCE OF SUPERVISORS IN SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONS, DATA WERE ANALYZED FROM A SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORM FOR 219 ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL (79.3 PERCENT OF 276 TOTAL), REPRESENTING LARGE CITY, MEDIUM CITY, SMALL CITY, AND CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST. APPLYING TECHNIQUES USED IN THE ANALYSIS OF BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS, THE STUDY REVEALED THAT CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SCHOOL SUPERVISORS ARE DETERMINED BY JOB PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR THE POSITION AND ESPECIALLY BY THE KIND OF DISTRICT CONCERNED. THIS LEADS TO THE FORMULATION OF "ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE" AS A DETERMINING VARIABLE IN THE SELECTION OF SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL FOR A PARTICULAR DISTRICT. DESCRIPTIONS ARE GIVEN FOR INDICES OF SUPERVISOR EFFECTIVENESS, AS INDICATED BY ORGANIZATIONAL REWARD (GRADE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT AND SALARY) AND OVERALL POTENTIAL FOR ACHIEVEMENT (BIOGRAPHICAL FACTORS, VERBAL ABILITY, INNER LIFE ORIENTATION, CONFORMITY, CREATIVITY, INNOVATION, AND MANAGERIAL, WORK, AND SOCIAL MOTIVATIONS). THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM PUBLICATIONS DEPARTMENT, CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, HENDRICKS HALL, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON 97403, FOR $2.00. (JK)

ED014797

the school administrator and organizational character

JOHN B. MINER

Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration
University of Oregon

the school
administrator
and
organizational
character

The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon is a national research and development center which was established under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education. The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Division of Educational Laboratories of the U. S. Office of Education. No federal funds were used in the publication of this report.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

the school administrator and organizational character

JOHN B. MINER
Professor of Management,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Consultant to the Firm,
McKINSEY & COMPANY, INC.

A publication of
THE CENTER FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Printed in the United States of America at the
University of Oregon Press, Eugene, Oregon

Designed and edited by Joanne M. Kitchel

The text of this book is set in Ronaldson type
on Simpson's eggshell text

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG NUMBER 67-65511

Foreword

In the Spring of 1964 the Executive Committee of CASEA prevailed upon Professor John B. Miner to undertake a study of the predictive value of a series of tests on school administrators. These tests have been used with great success in business, a field in which Dr. Miner has done pioneering and brilliant work. Through a series of unfortunate incidents the completion of this study has been delayed until the Spring of 1967, although it was scheduled for earlier completion. In part, this is due to Dr. Miner's absence from the campus in Eugene during the 1966-67 year.

Professor Miner studied 219 administrators in four different school systems using a series of evaluative instruments which he describes in this monograph. It is a serious and searching study. While it does not provide as conclusive predictive measures of success in administration as we in CASEA and Dr. Miner, himself, would have liked, its results are provocative and indicative. The study needs to be followed up in a number of its aspects, and this I hope very much Professor Miner will do. He has brought to this study a wealth of background from the School of Business Administration and his findings ought to be explored even more fully to see whether his approach has the same relevance for school administration as it does in his chosen field. I recommend this study highly to persons engaged in the teaching of educational administration and the training of administrators. It is a distinct contribution to the literature of the field.

PAUL B. JACOBSON, *Dean*
School of Education

July, 1967
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene, Oregon

Acknowledgments

The initial impetus behind this research was an interest in the comparative analysis of organizations. The writer has spent most of his professional life studying business firms and their workings. Do educational organizations operate in a similar manner? Are the managerial processes in these two contexts the same? Or are their dynamics quite different?

The establishment of the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon in the Spring of 1964 provided an opportunity to investigate these questions. That this opportunity was utilized, and that this first study in the area has been completed, is as much attributable to the efforts of others as it is to those of the writer.

In the initial stages major assistance came from Roland Pellegrin and Keith Goldhammer, at a time when they were faced with heavy demands in connection with the inception of the Center. Both have continued to provide support in a variety of ways. Together with Paul Jacobson, Richard Carlson, and Philip Runkel, they have introduced the writer to the literature of the field of school administration, and to some of the practical realities of administration in an educational context. Without the assistance provided by these five individuals it is very unlikely that the study would ever have reached completion.

In another area, the assistance of Phillip Foster was equally crucial. At a time when it appeared that the research would founder in a mass of data, he proposed statistical solutions and computer programs which eventually brought order out of chaos. Throughout the period of more than a year during which these various analyses were carried out, he made continuing and major contributions to the study, not only as a statistical assistant but as a true co-researcher.

My thanks also to Silvan Tomkins, Edwin Ghiselli, and W. W. Charters, Jr. for some very helpful comments on the original manuscript.

JOHN B. MINER

Berkeley, California

Contents

FOREWORD V

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS VII

PART 1 Districts, Measures, and Hypotheses 1

The School Districts and Their Administrators 1

The Criteria: Indexes of Organizational Value and Reward 3

The Potential Predictors: Biographical, Ability, and Personality Measures 12

PART 2 Effectiveness of the Potential Predictors 25

Age and Employment History 25

Verbal Ability 32

Managerial Motivation 36

Work Motivation 45

Social Motivation 51

Inner Life Cathexis 57

Conformity 63

PART 3 Organizational Character 68

Large City 68

Medium City 71

Small City 74

Consolidated District 77

PART 4 Guidelines for Educational Innovation 80

The Selection and Training of School Administrators 80

Studies of Organizational Character 85

REFERENCES 89

Illustrations

Figure 1 — School Administrator Evaluation Form 4

Figure 2 — Employment History 14

Table 1 — Mean Values for Indexes of Organizational Value in Each District 8

Table 2 — Correlations Between Indexes of Organizational Value in Total Sample 9

Table 3 — Mean Values for Indexes of Organizational Reward in Total Sample and in Each District 10

Table 4 — Correlations Between Indexes of Organizational Value and Indexes of Organizational Reward 11

Table 5 — United States Population Frequencies Used in Scoring for Conformity 22

Table 6 — School Administration Frequencies Used in Scoring for Conformity 23

Table 7 — Mean Ages and Values for Employment History Variables in Total Sample and in Each District 26

Table 8 — Correlations Between Age and Employment History Variables and Indexes of Organizational Value 28

Table 9 — Correlations Between Age and Employment History Variables and Indexes of Organizational Reward 30

Table 10 — Mean Vocabulary Score in Total Sample and in Each District 33

Table 11 — Mean Vocabulary Score on Form A in the School Districts and in Various Comparison Groups 33

Table 12 — Correlations Between Vocabulary Score and Indexes of Organizational Value 34

Table 13 — Correlations Between Vocabulary Score and Indexes of Organizational Reward 35

Table 14 — Mean Values for Managerial Motivation Measures in Total Sample and in Each District 37

Table 15 — Mean Values for Managerial Motivation Measures in Total Sample of School Administrators and Various Comparison Groups 37

Table 16 — Correlations Between Managerial Motivation Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value/Organizational Reward 40

Table 17 — Correlations Between Work Motivation Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value/Organizational Reward 46

Table 18 — Mean Values for Work Motivation Measures in Total Sample and in Each District 50

Table 19 — Correlations Between Social Motivation Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value/Organizational Reward 52

Table 20 — Mean Values for Social Motivation Measures in Total Sample and in Each District 56

Table 21 — Correlations Between Inner Life Cathexis Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value/Organizational Reward 58

Table 22 — Mean Values for Inner Life Cathexis Measures in Total Sample and in Each District 62

Table 23 — Mean Values for Conformity Measures in Total Sample and in Each District 63

Table 24 — Correlations Between Conformity Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value/Organizational Reward 64

Table 25 — Mean Values for Conformity Measures in Total Sample of School Administrators and in Various Comparison Groups 66

PART 1

Districts Measures and Hypotheses

Chapter 1

The School Districts and Their Administrators

The design for this research is very simple. In technical parlance it can be described as a concurrent validity study. In other words, various measures obtained on individuals (potential predictor variables), are correlated with various measures of these individuals' job performance (criteria), with the two sets of measures obtained at roughly the same point in time.

In this particular instance the predictor variables are primarily measures of individual motives and other personality characteristics (hence the use of the term *character* in the title). But some biographical and ability indexes have been included as well. The criterion variables are ratings made by superiors in each of the school districts, the salary paid the individual by his district, and the level attained in the administrative hierarchy of the district. Thus, all the job success indexes relate to the particular employing district rather than to the profession as a whole (hence the use of the term *organizational* in the title).

The districts chosen for study were all located within a particular section of the United States (the Pacific Northwest) with the result that geographical location was held relatively constant across organizations. On the other hand, generalization of the results from these four districts to other districts located in areas of the country with very different economies, ethnic compositions, etc. would not seem justified without further research.

Every effort was made to vary the size of the school districts over as large a range as possible. Since, however, the research was to focus on the administrative component only, it was not possible to include any districts located in small towns and sparsely populated rural areas. Such districts do not normally have enough administrators to permit a meaningful type of statistical analysis. The organizations studied were located in a large city (over 300,000 population), a medium-sized city (in the 60,000 to 80,000 range), and a small city (in the 20,000 to 40,000 range). Also included was a recently consolidated district which was spread over a rather sizeable area, partially suburban and partially rural.

Within each district the administrative component was defined in accordance with the organization's own standards. However, all individuals included as administrators had to be occupying positions for which an administrative certificate was required. The job titles encompassed by the administrative designation, and certain other information on the groups studied, are provided below.

Large City. The positions included were those of Elementary Teaching Principal, Elementary Supervising Principal, High School Principal, Director, Assistant Superintendent, and Superintendent. It was not possible to get measures on all of these individuals, but data were obtained on 82 people, 63 per cent of the total administrative component. All indications are that those studied were representative of the larger group. Eleven per cent were women.

Medium City. The positions included were those of Elementary Principal, Junior High School Vice-Principal, Junior High School Principal, High School Vice-Principal, High School Principal, Director, Assistant Superintendent, and Superintendent. Measures were obtained on 57 administrators, 92 per cent of the total. Twelve per cent were women.

Small City. The positions included were Elementary Principal, Junior High School Vice-Principal, Junior High School Principal, High

School Vice-Principal, High School Principal, certain Supervisors, Director, Assistant Superintendent, and Superintendent. Measures were obtained on 44 administrators, 94 per cent of the administrative group. Eighteen per cent were women.

Consolidated District. The positions included were Elementary Principal, Junior High School Vice-Principal, Junior High School Principal, High School Vice-Principal, High School Principal, Coordinator, Director, Assistant Superintendent, and Superintendent. Measures were obtained on 36 administrators, 97 per cent of the total. Only one woman was included.

It is apparent that in three of the districts the groups studied amounted to almost 100 per cent of the relevant population. In the other instance there is every reason to believe that increasing the group size to the 100 per cent point would not have had any meaningful impact on the conclusions. Thus, the summary statistics developed from the data are descriptive of the four organizational populations, as reflected through the administrative components.

Chapter 2

The Criteria: Indexes of Organizational Value and Reward

Ratings of job effectiveness were obtained using the School Administrator Evaluation Form shown in Figure 1. This form was filled out on each individual except the superintendents (who were deleted from this aspect of the analysis) by the one or two superiors most likely to be familiar with the individual's work.

In Large City the ratings were made by the Superintendent, two Assistant Superintendents, and three Directors of Elementary Education. In all but 28 cases the evaluation forms were filled out by two superiors and the two ratings then averaged to obtain the figure used. It was not possible to get dual ratings on the central office staff and on some of the elementary principals.

In Medium City the ratings were made by the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, the Director of Secondary Education and the Director of Research. Two evaluations were obtained on all but 14 individuals. These latter were primarily vice-principals.

In Small City the ratings were made by the Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, the Director of Personnel, the Director of Elementary Education, and the Director of Secondary Education. All individuals received two evaluations.

In Consolidated District the ratings were made by the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent. All but three men in the central office received two evaluations.

FIGURE 1

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORM

Name of Person Being Evaluated ....

Name of Person Making Evaluation ....

Please check the one category for each of the following ten job-related factors which best represents your considered judgment regarding the individual being evaluated.

The three scales which follow deal with the individual's level of *performance* in his job—his contribution to the basic task of getting the children and youth of the community educated.

1. *Performance in relation to subordinates.* Ability to elicit effective work from his or her subordinates.		2. *Performance in relation to community.* Ability to draw on the resources of the community and its representatives in a way which facilitates the attainment of educational objectives.		3. *Performance in relation to students.* Ability to develop and implement policies, rules and procedures with reference to students which contribute to student learning.	
Outstanding +	....	Outstanding +	....	Outstanding +	....
Outstanding	....	Outstanding	....	Outstanding	....
Outstanding −	....	Outstanding −	....	Outstanding −	....
Good +	....	Good +	....	Good +	....
Good	....	Good	....	Good	....
Good −	....	Good −	....	Good −	....
Satisfactory +	....	Satisfactory +	....	Satisfactory +	....
Satisfactory	....	Satisfactory	....	Satisfactory	....
Satisfactory −	....	Satisfactory −	....	Satisfactory −	....
Unsatisfactory	....	Unsatisfactory	....	Unsatisfactory	....
Not Relevant	....	Not Relevant	....	Not Relevant	....

The next three scales deal with the individual's capacity to elicit positive feelings and *attitudes* in others—his contribution to the maintenance of the school system as a stable, ongoing structure which is relatively free of conflict and dissatisfaction.

4. *Effect on attitudes of subordinates.*

Ability to create and maintain high levels of satisfaction among subordinates and to keep dissension to a minimum.

Outstanding + ...
Outstanding ....
Outstanding — ....
Good + ...
Good ....
Good — ....
Satisfactory + ...
Satisfactory ....
Satisfactory — ....
Unsatisfactory ....
Not Relevant ....

5. *Effect on attitudes in the community.*

Ability to deal with the community and its representatives in a way which fosters a favorable public feeling toward the school system and minimizes overt conflict between the schools and the community.

Outstanding + ...
Outstanding ....
Outstanding — ....
Good + ...
Good ....
Good — ....
Satisfactory + ...
Satisfactory ....
Satisfactory — ....
Unsatisfactory ....
Not Relevant ....

6. *Effect on attitudes of the students.*

Ability to develop and implement policies, rules and procedures with reference to students, which lead to student satisfaction and a generally favorable feeling toward school.

Outstanding + ...
Outstanding ....
Outstanding — ....
Good + ...
Good ....
Good — ....
Satisfactory + ...
Satisfactory ....
Satisfactory — ....
Unsatisfactory ....
Not Relevant ....

The next two scales provide an opportunity for you to indicate your total judgment of the individual as a school administrator.

7. *Overall evaluation* as a school administrator, taking into account the six factors noted previously and any other factors you may consider important in this type of work.

Outstanding + ...
Outstanding ....
Outstanding — ....
Good + ...
Good ....
Good — ....
Satisfactory + ...
Satisfactory ....
Satisfactory — ....
Unsatisfactory ....

8. *Potential for advancement* to higher levels of responsibility in the field of educational administration, either in the present school system or elsewhere.

Outstanding Potential + ...
Outstanding Potential ....
Outstanding Potential — ....
Good Potential + ...
Good Potential ....
Good Potential — ....
Limited Potential + ...
Limited Potential ....
Limited Potential — ....
No Potential ....
Likely to be fired or demoted ....

The final two scales deal with special characteristics which may or may not be important to success in a particular administrative position.

9. Ability to think of new solutions to educational problems and to develop new approaches—to be personally creative and original.

Outstanding + ...
Outstanding ....
Outstanding — ....
Good + ...
Good ....
Good — ....
Limited + ...
Limited ....
Limited — ....
No Ability ....

10. Ability to put the new ideas of others into effect—to innovate within the school system and to utilize the newest techniques.

Outstanding + ...
Outstanding ....
Outstanding — ....
Good + ...
Good ....
Good — ....
Limited + ...
Limited ....
Limited — ....
No Ability ....
Actively Opposes Innovations ....

Comments:

The School Administrator Evaluation Form was constructed with the intent that items one through three would provide indexes of contribution to the district's task objective, items four through six indexes of contribution to organizational maintenance, items seven and eight indexes of contribution to organizational goals in toto, and items nine and ten contributions in certain specific areas currently considered to be of major importance (Carlson, 1965). It was anticipated the correlations between ratings would be relatively low and that accordingly a predictor might be strongly related to one rating item while yielding no correlation with another. In view of the fact that the Not Relevant category on items one through six was not used, it seems clear that the rating variables selected do have significance for school administrators generally, irrespective of the specific position.

In scoring items one through seven a 0 was assigned to the Unsatisfactory designation and a 9 to Outstanding+. On item eight the range was from a 0 for Likely to be fired or demoted to 10 for Outstanding Potential +. On item nine No Ability received a 0 and Outstanding + an 8. On item ten Actively Opposes Innovations was 0 and Outstanding+ 10.

When the actual ratings on the various indexes were obtained, it soon became apparent that items one through three were measuring much the same thing. In the total sample, scores on the three individual items correlated with the average score for the three (the Performance Score) in the range .90 to .94. Essentially the same picture emerged in all four districts. Similarly, items four through six were correlated with their average (the Attitude Score) in the range .91 to .93, with the pattern across districts equally consistent.

Thus, it seemed appropriate to combine the rating data into seven indexes:

Performance Score: the average of the scores assigned to items one through three.

Attitude Score: the average of the scores assigned to items four through six.

Composite Score: the average of the scores assigned to items one through six.

Overall Evaluation: the score on item seven.

Potential: the score on item eight.

Creativity: the score on item nine.

Innovation: the score on item ten.

In all cases the score for an item refers to either a single rating or the average of the ratings by two superiors, if dual evaluations were obtained.

The conclusion to combine items is supported by the reliability data. These were obtained by correlating the two sets of ratings on the same individuals. The average reliabilities for items one through three were .65, .55, and .57; yet the Performance Score value was .68. The average reliabilities for items four through six were .59, .60, and .55; for the Attitude Score .66. The Composite Score had a reliability of .71 which rather unexpectedly turned out to be almost identical with those for the single-item Overall Evaluation (.72) and Potential (.73) measures. Yet the remaining single-item scores dropped back down to the level of items one through six—Creativity .53 and Innovation .63.

The mean rating values for each district are presented in Table 1. It is clear that the scale designations used did serve to prevent the common tendency for ratings to concentrate at the very top of the scale. The Performance, Attitude and Composite Scores all average in the Good to Outstanding— range. The Overall Evaluation averages run from just below Good to just above Good +. The Potential values are

Table 1: Mean Values for Indexes of Organizational Value in Each District

	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District
Performance Score	5.0	5.5	6.6	6.1
Attitude Score	5.0	5.5	6.5	6.0
Composite Score	5.0	5.5	6.6	6.0
Overall Evaluation	4.9	5.2	6.2	5.9
Potential	4.7	5.7	6.8	4.9
Creativity	4.8	5.1	6.3	5.1
Innovation	5.7	6.2	7.2	6.2

more dispersed, extending from below Good Potential — to Good Potential +, but they remain in the center of the scale. Creativity averages from below Good + to above Outstanding —; Innovation in the range from below Good to above Good +.

The standard deviations vary considerably from measure to measure and district to district. Very few are below 1.0, however, and a number are over 2.0. Thus, an adequate degree of differentiation among individuals was obtained. Yet with standard deviations of this order it becomes clear that the ratings given in the various districts do differ in a meaningful way (see Table 1). The ratings in Large City are consistently low and those in Small City consistently high. It seems unlikely (in view of pay scales, intelligence differences, and other considerations) that real differences in job performance across districts could account for these variations. A much more likely explanation is that there were differences in frames of reference among the top administrators who made the evaluations. On the assumption, then, that rater biases were involved, the ratings were converted to standard scores setting the mean for each district equal to 50 and the standard deviation equal to 10. These standard scores were used in all analyses involving the total administrative sample; thus inter-district variations in the ratings were removed.

It is apparent from Table 2 that the original assumption of low correlations between rating variables was not borne out. The ratings are consistently closely related, suggesting that some central concept of organizational value has permeated all the evaluations, irrespective of the specific characteristic noted. Actually, the lowest correlation obtained was .49, between Creativity and Innovation in Small City; in general, the individual districts performed much as the total sample

Table 2: Correlations Between Indexes of Organizational Value in Total Sample

	Attitude Score	Composite Score	Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation
Performance Score	.93	.96	.87	.77	.66	.69
Attitude Score		.96	.87	.75	.61	.67
Composite Score			.87	.77	.65	.69
Overall Evaluation				.80	.66	.73
Potential					.71	.72
Creativity						.75

did. Thus, there is no reason to consider the Performance Score, Attitude Score, Composite Score, and Overall Evaluation as separate entities. They all appear to be measuring much the same thing. In the case of Potential, Creativity, and Innovation some differentiation associated with the characteristics described seems to have emerged. Yet these ratings are clearly influenced to a large degree by the same factor as the others. A tendency to positively value certain personal characteristics and behaviors, and negatively value others runs throughout all the evaluations. This influence apparently operated consistently as the top administrators moved through the evaluation forms. Thus, the ratings appear to reflect a generalized organizational value structure (or at least a top administrator value structure). Whether, however, the personal characteristics and behaviors valued remain constant from district to district, or reflect a distinct organizational character, is an empirical question. The data of Part 2 provide an answer.

In addition to these ratings, which reflect organizational value, two indexes of organizational reward were also used as criteria. The first of these was the individual's Grade Level, based on each district's job evaluation procedures, and reflecting differences in status. A grade of 1 was assigned to the lowest administrative position and the various distinguishable levels numbered on up to that of the superintendent. In Large City the highest grade received was a 7; in Medium City 9; in Small City 7; in Consolidated District 6. In spite of the differences in the distance from the top to the bottom of the administrative hierarchy, the mean grade levels across districts did not differ significantly, as the data of Table 3 demonstrate. In view of this fact and the very realistic consideration that the superintendent of Medium City, for instance, was actually further removed from the lowest administrative level than the superintendent of Consolidated District, a decision was made not to standardize the grade level data before combining the districts. Thus, the total sample figures are based on original figures, and the superintendent in Medium City is the highest level individual studied.

Table 3: Mean Values for Indexes of Organizational Reward in Total Sample and in Each District

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Grade Level	2.81	3.05	3.00	2.42	2.54	2.53	....
Salary	$10,949	11,289	10,418	11,248	10,777	4.64	<.01
Significant Comparisons—Salary				t	P		
Large City vs.							
Medium City				2.93	<.01		
Consolidated District				1.97	<.05		
Small City vs.							
Medium City				2.98	<.01		
Consolidated District				1.99	<.05		

The Grade Level criterion reflects the status reward given an administrator by his employing organization. A second index reflected the monetary reward given the individual during 1964-65, the year the testing was carried out. No attempt was made to correct this figure for duration of the work year. It seemed apparent that the total amount paid during the year was in fact the reward received from the organization, whether the employment contract specified a nine month period, or twelve month period, or something in between. This is what the individual's particular contribution was considered to be worth to the district. Thus, the criterion used was the total annual compensation rather than the rate per month of employment. As Table 3 indicates, Large City and Small City were ahead of the other districts in average pay. However, no attempt was made to correct for these district differences in combining the groups to form the total sample. The argument here is that if one district pays more it is in fact offering larger rewards, and this differential should be reflected in the final criterion. Thus, an absolute rather than a relative measure was used.

These two indexes of the reward given the administrator were as highly correlated in the total sample as the value indexes (.81). In the separate districts the coefficients were .89 for Large City, .85 for Medium City, .87 for Small City, and .81 for Consolidated District.

Table 4: Correlations Between Indexes of Organizational Value and Indexes of Organizational Reward

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score	Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation
Total Sample							
Grade Level	.06(.18)*	—.02(.09)	.02(.13)	.01(.12)	.03(.21)**	—.08(.01)	—.08(.02)
Salary	.02(.16)*	—.06(.07)	—.04(.10)	—.04(.10)	—.01(.22)**	—.11(.00)	—.08(.06)
Large City							
Grade Level	.00(.22)	—.10(.08)	—.07(.13)	—.11(.10)	—.03(.28)*	.02(.16)	—.05(.07)
Salary	.01(.30)*	—.10(.16)	—.05(.23)	—.07(.22)	—.02(.39)**	.02(.21)	.01(.19)
Medium City							
Grade Level	.27*(.37)**	.19(.32)*	.25(.38)**	.15(.24)	.22(.38)**	—.09(.02)	—.19(—.08)
Salary	.15(.33)*	.05(.24)	.09(.28)*	.04(.18)	.08(.33)*	—.20(—.04)	—.28*(—.13)
Small City							
Grade Level	—.17(—.16)	—.23(—.22)	—.23(—.22)	—.12(—.11)	—.12(—.09)	—.41(—.41)**	—.12(—.09)
Salary	—.07(—.06)	—.13(—.12)	—.12(—.11)	—.02(—.01)	—.01(.01)	—.27(—.27)	.01(.03)
Consolidated District							
Grade Level	.01(.19)	—.05(.12)	.01(.20)	.07(.27)	—.10(.16)	.09(.25)	.08(.24)
Salary	—.08(.12)	—.12(.06)	—.13(.07)	—.04(.17)	—.18(.11)	.01(.20)	.01(.19)

*$P < .05$

**$P < .01$

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Ideally an organization should reward a member for exhibiting behavior which is valued. This tends to reinforce valued behavior and provide maximal motivation for meeting role requirements. Unfortunately, however, organizational rewards tend to remain static—once a man is promoted, or his salary raised, a downward adjustment is unlikely. Yet organizational values may gradually shift in a variety of directions. Behavior which is considered desirable at one point in time may not be valued under revised circumstances. Thus, reward and value structures can get badly out of phase, with consequent negative implications for overall organizational goal attainment.

As Table 4 indicates, such an imbalance between value and reward structures seems to be characteristic in the school districts studied. In the sample as a whole there is little evidence of a relationship between the two. When age is not partialed out, a barely significant positive relationship involving one rating variable does emerge in Medium City, but that is all. On the other hand, significant relationships of a negative type are found in both Medium City and Small City, with reference to Innovation and Creativity, respectively. Thus, if there is any predominant trend it is one in which a lack of originality and a failure to innovate are rewarded. On the other hand, when age effects are removed, and probably this is the more appropriate procedure, a definite positive relationship between value structure and reward does emerge in Medium City and to a limited degree in Large City also. Yet two districts yield no evidence of such a relationship at all, and the significant partial correlations obtained in the total sample remain very low. Clearly, value-reward incongruency is a problem in school districts of the kind studied.

Chapter 3

The Potential Predictors: Biographical, Ability, and Personality Measures

Biographical Factors. The biographical factors included in the study were selected primarily because of the possible biases they might introduce into relationships between potential predictors and criteria. Thus, no intensive analysis of associations between the administrators' prior experience and subsequent success was attempted. The age of the individual was selected for study, however, on the assumption that it should be positively related to both grade level and salary, and negatively related to the potential ratings. There was some thought that it might prove to be correlated with the other value indexes as well. Should any of these anticipated relationships emerge, the influence of the age factor should be controlled in the predictor-criterion correlations. It seemed important, for instance, to study the relationship between conformity and salary quite independent of the fact that older people tend to be paid more and to conform less (Miner, 1965). The crucial point is whether conformity and salary are related when age is held constant (in a group of comparable age).

Another biographical factor which seemed to require attention was the extent to which the individual had changed jobs, either vertically or laterally, within a district, as against inter-district job changing. The hypothesis was that those with many in-district changes might well be valued and rewarded disproportionately. On the other hand, the "job hoppers," the out-district changers, might be treated in a generally more negative manner. If such a bias were to emerge consistently, it should be eliminated from the predictor-criterion relationships in much the same way as the seniority or age bias.

In order to obtain employment history information which could be used in establishing a tendency toward in-district and/or out-district changing, the form presented in Figure 2 was given to all administrators. Each change subsequent to the individual's first entry into a school district was noted. In this connection transfers from one school to another within a district, which did not involve a new job title, were excluded. So were periods of university attendance. But employment outside the field of education was included if it occurred subsequent to the first school district employment. In the case of Consolidated District, the change in district title which occurred at the time of consolidation was not considered a true job change.

Three indexes were computed from the data. The Total Job Changes per Year figure was obtained by adding all changes and dividing by the number of years since initial entry into a school district. This figure was then broken down to provide In-District and Out-District rates. It is important to keep in mind that in-district changes need not have occurred in the district where the man was currently employed. Any shift from one position to another within the same district contributed to the in-district figure. Although many such shifts did occur within the district under study, this was by no means a universal pattern.

FIGURE 2

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Name..

Please list all full-time positions held, other than temporary work and summer employment. A separate listing should be given whenever any one of the following three possibilities has occurred:

1) You changed from one employing organization (such as a school district) to another *without* any change in position title.
2) You changed from one employing organization to another *with* a change in position title.
3) You experienced a change of position title *within* the same employing organization.

It would be helpful if you would start with your first position and then work forward in time, listing your present job last.

Position Title ....

Employing Organization ....

Location of Work ....

Dates (month & year) From... To...

(Provision is made on this form for the respondent to list ten positions.)

Verbal Ability. The ability measure employed was a 40-item vocabulary test with a multiple-choice format, which was originally developed for use in connection with public opinion interviewing (Thorndike, 1942; Thorndike and Gallup, 1944). This measure is highly correlated with widely accepted indexes of general intelligence (Miner, 1961). In a group of salesmen and sales managers with test scores roughly comparable to the school administrators, it yielded a value of .73 when related to the Terman Concept Mastery Test and .56 when related to the verbal part of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. The score used was the number of items answered correctly. Guessing was encouraged and in those few cases where items were skipped a chance correction was applied based on the assumption that if the individual had guessed on these items he would have selected the correct answer once in five times.

Managerial Motivation. The measure used here was the Miner Sentence Completion Scale (Miner, 1964). The subject is asked to employ a series of initial stems in concocting complete sentences that express his real feelings. These responses are scored as to whether they indicate positive, negative or neutral feelings toward the people or activities noted in the stems. There are 40 items, but only 35 actually are used in scoring. The measurement is of the indirect or projective type and the subjects cannot tell from merely reading the items what is being measured.

There are seven subscales, each consisting of five items. In each instance the score may vary from + 5 to — 5. The former would reflect a consistent positive feeling or attitude extending across all items of the subscale; the latter an equally consistent negative feeling. The subscales yield measures of the following characteristics:

Attitude toward authority figures

Attitude toward competitive games

Attitude toward competitive situations generally

Attitude toward taking a masculine role

Attitude toward imposing one's wishes on others

Attitude toward standing out from the group

Attitude toward routine administrative functions

An overall index, called the Item Score, is obtained by adding the seven subscale scores. This can, of course, vary from + 35 to — 35. In addition, a second comprehensive measure, the Rare Score, provides a means of measuring motivation with the effects of what is common or popular in a particular reference group removed (Tomkins and Miner, 1957). The patterns of positive and negative responses to each subscale given by each individual are compared against normative data from a particular reference group, in this case the total sample of 219 administrators. If the particular pattern of positive responses given by the individual on the subscale is one which occurs among less than five per cent of the normative group members, then a positive rare is credited; if the same thing occurs among negative responses to the the subscale items, a negative rare is credited. There are, of course, seven subscales, each of which can yield a positive or a negative rare. In addition, positive and negative rares may be obtained as a function of the patterns of responses on the test as a whole. Thus, the Rare Score may vary from + 8 to — 8. This particular index can be presumed to tap motivational patterns which are individual in nature, since the impact of membership in the school administrator group as a whole has been largely eliminated.

The two composite measures, the Item and Rare Scores, are rather highly related in the total school administrator sample. The correlation is .81. On the other hand, the various subscales, although almost without exception positively related to each other, are essentially independent. The highest intercorrelation is .29 and the median figure .13.

The Miner Sentence Completion Scale was originally constructed as a measure of attitude toward various aspects of the managerial role as it exists in hierarchically structured administrative organizations, especially those of a business nature. Within this context it has proved to have considerable validity (Miner, 1965). Correlations between total scores and indexes of organizational value have averaged in the low .40s. Correlations with indexes of organizational reward tend to concentrate in the middle .30s. The highest subscale validities in the business world have been obtained with the Authority Figures, Competitive Situations, and Imposing Wishes measures.

The use of this particular measure in the present study was predicated on the assumption that attitudes toward managerial role requirements, or managerial motivation, may be as important in professional or semi-professional organizations such as school districts (Etzioni, 1964), as in strictly administrative structures. Thus a positive relationship with both the organizational value and the reward indexes was hypothesized.

Work Motivation. A second factor which it was thought might be related to success in school administration was the extent to which the individual was motivated to engage in active physical work. Originally this personality characteristic was considered because of its presumed potentiality for predicting those variables to which the Performance Score contributed. When, however, it became apparent that differential prediction among the various ratings was unlikely, because of their high intercorrelation, a more widespread relationship with value and reward indexes was hypothesized.

Measurement in this area was achieved through the use of the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test (Tomkins and Miner, 1957, 1959). This test contains 25 plates, each of which consists of three line drawings. These drawings are to be arranged in an order which makes the best sense to the subject, and a brief sentence is written with reference to each of the three pictures to tell the story. For the purposes of this study only the arrangements selected by the administrators were used, not the verbal stories.

Scoring was carried out using a technique developed specifically for the present research. The keys employed are in some ways similar to those originally developed for the test (Tomkins and Miner, 1957), but differ in a number of important respects. Among the 25 plates, 14 were identified which dealt with active work in some way. On each of these, that arrangement of the three pictures which involved moving the central character from an initial position farthest removed from work through some intermediate state to a final position involving the maximal work effort (and pleasure in that work, if the plate permitted such an interpretation) was considered indicative of a direct type of approach motivation insofar as work was concerned. Approach motivation of a more indirect type was inferred from arrangements which involved placing the intermediate state in the final position, if it depicted some work (no work—maximal work—intermediate with work) or in the initial position, if it did not (intermediate without work—no work—maximal work). The direct and indirect avoidance arrangements were the exact opposites of the approach measures. Thus, the pictures portraying the central character as working were moved from the end of the arrangement when they reflected enduring activity to the beginning where work was rapidly terminated. Five subscales were developed in the work area as follows:

Where Passivity is Possible (the plate deals with work and at least one of the pictures depicts complete passivity in the work situation)—Plates, 3, 5, 9, 15, and 25.

Where Passivity is Not Possible (the plate deals with work and none of the pictures depicts anything approximating real passivity in the work situation)—Plates 7, 13, 16, 17, and 21.

Where Leaving is Possible (the plate deals with work and at least one of the pictures depicts the central character either outside the current work situation or fantasying such an escape)—Plates 1, 6, 16, 18, and 20.

Where Problems are Present (the plate deals with work and one of the pictures depicts the central character facing some type of a problem in connection with his work)—Plates 3, 7, 9, 13, and 17.

Where Distractions are Present (the plate deals with work and one of the pictures depicts a distraction which might take the central character away from his work; the approach responses reflect a compulsive or super-ego controlled orientation to work)—Plates 13, 16, 18, 21, and 25.

Each of these subscales was scored much as the subscales of the Miner Sentence Completion Scale are. All approach responses were considered as indicative of positive motivation, the avoidance scales as negative. Thus, on each of the five subscales the scores could vary from + 5 to − 5.

In addition, the frequencies for approach and avoidance, both direct and indirect, were recorded. Each of these could, of course, vary from 0 to 14. However, because many arrangements fell in neither category, these indexes do not total to 14. An overall Item Score in the work area was computed by assigning a plus to both direct and indirect approach arrangements and a minus to direct and indirect avoidance arrangements. This measure could potentially vary from + 14 to − 14.

Finally, a second overall measure was developed with a view to eliminating that which is conventional or conforming in the school administrator group. This was a Rare Score which was in many ways similar to the Rare Score obtained from the Miner Sentence Completion Scale. All patterns of arrangements on either the Direct Approach, the Indirect Approach, the Direct Avoidance, or the Indirect Avoidance keys, which occurred less than 5 per cent of the time in the total school administrator sample were identified. Then, whenever an individual gave such a pattern, which might involve a single arrangement but usually involved two or more, he was credited with a rare. No more than one rare could be obtained on a single key and duplicated patterns occurring on two or more subscales were counted only once. The Rare Score was computed by assigning plus values to approach rares (direct or indirect) and minus values to avoidance rares (direct or indirect).

The Item and Rare Scores correlate .61 in the total school administrator sample. The five subscale scores are all positively related, the highest value being .67 and the median .38. The two approach indexes are consistently positively related to the overall and subscale measures (in the range .31 to .70) and the two avoidance indexes negatively related (in the range —.20 to —.64). Direct and Indirect Approach to Work are entirely independent of one another, as are Direct and Indirect Avoidance of Work. The approach measures are consistently negatively related to the avoidance measures, although the highest value is —.39.

Social Motivation. Motivation to participate in social interaction was another personality variable hypothesized to have a relationship with success in the field of school administration. In the initial formulations it was assumed that positive motivation of this kind would contribute primarily to the rating variables involving the Attitude Score. As with the hypothesis involving work motivation, however, this expectation had to be broadened in light of the findings regarding the intercorrelations between the various indexes of organizational value.

The Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test was again used as a measuring device, and the approach employed paralleled that used with work motivation in a number of respects. There are 13 plates dealing with social interaction. Direct approach motivation in this area was inferred from arrangements where the central character moved from an initial condition of minimal social interaction or no such interaction at all, through an intermediate state to maximal, positive interaction. Indirect approach motivation was reflected in arrangements where the intermediate state was shifted either to the final or the initial position depending on whether it indicated some degree of social interaction or not. Direct and indirect avoidance motivation was reflected in reversals of the approach measures. Thus, pictures depicting the central character as engaged in social interactions were shifted from the later positions, where the social relationship depicted would continue, to the earlier positions where it would be terminated.

Again five subscales were developed to cover various aspects of social motivation:

In Non-Work Situation (the plate contains two or more people and does not portray a work environment for the central character)—Plates 2, 8, 10, 22, and 23.

With Authority Figures (the plate contains two or more people one of whom appears to hold a position of authority over the central character in the work situation)—Plates 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21.

In Group Situation (the plate contains at least one picture depicting three or more people)—Plates 4, 6, 8, 18, and 22.

Involving Close Proximity (the plate contains at least one picture depicting physical contact between two or more people)—Plates 2, 5, 10, 21, and 22.

Involving Emotional Support (the plate contains at least one picture depicting the central character receiving assistance, praise, instruction, or domination)—Plates 2, 5, 9, 17, and 23.

Subscale scoring involved assigning positive values to approach arrangements (direct or indirect) and negative values to avoidance arrangements (direct or indirect). The possible range was thus +5 to —5. In addition to the four individual approach and avoidance indexes, an Item Score and a Rare Score were obtained in the same manner as for work motivation, the only difference being that 13 rather than 14 plates were involved.

Item and Rare Scores correlate .59. The subscale scores tend to be positively related, although there are several negligible negative values. The highest correlation is .64 and the median .35. The two approach measures are consistently positively related to the overall and subscale measures (in the range .17 to .65) and the avoidance measures negatively related (—.17 to —.58). In both the approach and the avoidance areas the direct and indirect indexes are uncorrelated with each other. The two approach variables are negatively related to the two avoidance variables with the highest value being —.37. In general these patterns of internal correlations are very similar to those for the work motivation measures.

Inner Life Cathexis. A third general type of personality variable measured by the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test involves the tendency to devote long periods of time to emotional expression and thought. Originally it was anticipated that this propensity to cathect inner processes would be related to the creativity ratings and perhaps to innovative behavior. As with the other specific hypotheses, however, a modification to include other variables had to be made when the evaluations proved to be far from independent.

Inner life in one form or another is clearly reflected in 12 plates of the Picture Arrangement Test. Three subscales were developed using these plates:

Thought (the plate deals with the thought processes of the central character, either in the area of problem solving or fantasy)—Plates 1, 3, 6, 13, and 25.

Positive Emotion (the plate contains at least one picture depicting the central character as happy)—Plates 2, 10, 11, 12, and 15.

Negative Emotion (the plate contains at least one picture depicting the central character as unhappy or anxious)—Plates 2, 10, 12, 16, and 21.

From each of these three subscales scores varying from +5 to —5 were obtained as with the previous measures. Direct approach on a given subscale involved moving either from no inner life through an intermediate state to maximal inner life, or in the case of the two emotion scales, moving from the opposite emotion through an intermediate state to the emotion measured. The indirect approach indexes were constructed in all cases merely by reversing the first two pictures so that the intermediate state came first. As in the other instances the direct and indirect avoidance indexes were obtained by reversing the approach arrangements so that the particular inner life process was rapidly terminated rather than continuing.

The direct and indirect approach scores were computed by totaling the appropriate arrangements across subscales. The maximum possible score in each instance was 12. On the avoidance side, some of the arrangements did in fact reflect inner life cathexis, but of an emotion opposite to that measured by the subscale. When these were eliminated, the top possible score for Direct Avoidance was 8 and for Indirect Avoidance 11. The Item Score was obtained by subtracting the avoidance total from the approach total. The Rare Score was based on the pattern utilized with work motivation and social motivation. Subscale avoidance rares were not included, however, if they contained the arrangements meaning "opposite" emotion. The Item and Rare Scores followed the same pattern in this regard.

The correlation between Item Score and Rare Score was .53. The Thought subscale was essentially uncorrelated with the other two, but Positive and Negative Emotion were negatively related (—.54). The two approach measures were consistently positively related to subscale and overall measures (in the range .21 to .59) except for the Negative Emotion subscale. In this latter case the Direct Approach index had a negligible negative correlation and the Indirect Approach index a correlation of .25. The two avoidance measures were consistently negatively related to both the subscale and overall scores (range —.09 to —.61). Direct and Indirect Approach are somewhat negatively correlated with a value of —.24, while the two avoidance variables are essentially unrelated. The approach and avoidance measures tend to be negatively correlated, but the highest figure is —.31. In general the internal consistency of the Inner Life Cathexis measures is considerably less than that obtained with the work and social motivation measures.

Conformity. Conformity was also measured with the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test, but in a manner differing considerably from that employed with the variables noted to this point. There are six ways in which the three pictures of each plate may be arranged. It is possible to determine empirically what proportion of a given population would be expected to select each of the six. The test has in fact been administered to a representative sample of the United States population age 10 and above by Gallup Poll interviewers (Tomkins and Miner, 1957). The percentages calculated from this group of 1500 individuals are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: United States Population Frequencies Used in Scoring for Conformity

Plate Number	Arrangement					
	VOL	VLO	OLV	OVL	LVO	LOV
1	27	28	4	12	23	6
2	11	4	11	3	11	(61)
3	30	3	21	20	7	19
4	31	11	23	1	1	33
5	36	21	12	14	7	9
6	34	43	2	7	8	6
7	4	7	7	37	45	1
8	8	8	2	(58)	23	2
9	15	6	31	17	20	12
10	(65)	7	9	14	3	3
11	9	25	16	6	14	36
12	2	14	(52)	6	4	22
13	15	(52)	5	2	10	16
14	(69)	5	1	4	2	19
15	28	9	11	14	3	36
16	1	(86)	3	2	4	5
17	33	19	12	23	11	3
18	38	7	9	24	10	13
19	4	17	28	2	4	45
20	11	2	3	36	45	3
21	2	(84)	1	1	4	8
22	2	7	21	(51)	20	1
23	30	23	19	3	3	23
24	20	40	5	5	12	18
25	31	19	14	25	5	7

Numbers in parentheses indicate "norms," i.e. responses given by 50 per cent or more of the population tested.

From these frequencies a measure of conformity called the Average Frequency of Responses in the United States may be calculated. This is done by totaling the values in the table associated with the specific arrangements the individual has selected and dividing by 25. The resulting figure represents an estimate of the extent to which the respondent, in his everyday life, selects responses which are frequently or rarely given by others in the population; that is, which are conforming or deviant relative to U.S. culture as a whole.

In addition to this overall estimate of the degree to which an individual's total behavior tends toward conformity or deviance, it is also possible to compute an estimate of the extent of adherence to social norms. For this purpose a norm is arbitrarily defined as a response (arrangement) which is given by 50 per cent or more of a group. All such norms have been put in parentheses in Table 5. In the United

Table 6: School Administration Frequencies Used in Scoring for Conformity

Plate	Arrangement					
Number	VOL	VLO	OLV	OVL	LVO	LOV
1	41	19	6	5	29	0
2	7	2	4	1	6	(80)
3	(52)	1	18	9	8	11
4	35	7	9	0	0	49
5	23	44	11	15	3	4
6	18	(66)	0	3	7	6
7	0	5	5	32	(58)	0
8	1	1	0	(80)	16	1
9	21	5	39	8	19	8
10	(60)	16	14	7	2	0
11	8	10	27	3	16	35
12	1	16	(56)	3	4	19
13	5	(63)	4	1	9	19
14	(83)	0	0	3	0	14
15	28	9	6	15	3	40
16	0	(92)	2	2	1	3
17	28	35	5	23	9	0
18	37	9	15	11	11	16
19	1	16	21	1	0	(61)
20	3	1	3	23	(65)	5
21	1	(75)	0	0	2	22
22	0	3	17	(64)	15	0
23	30	28	21	3	2	17
24	11	49	6	3	22	9
25	34	9	23	22	3	9

Numbers in parentheses indicate "norms," i.e. responses given by 50 per cent or more of the population tested.

States population nine of the arrangements meet this test. The Adherence to United States Norms score is established by determining how many of these nine arrangements the individual actually selects. In the total school administrator sample the Average Frequency and Adherence to Norms measures derived using U.S. population frequencies correlate .81.

In addition to these indexes of conformity relative to society as a whole, it is also possible to determine whether an individual is a conformist relative to some group of which he is a member. This has been done in the case of the school administrators, using the total sample to establish base frequencies. These frequencies are presented in Table 6.

Scoring for Average Frequency of Responses Among School Administrators and Adherence to School Administrator Norms was carried out just as with the United States measures, but using the data of Table 6, rather than those of Table 5. There are 14 norms (arrangements with 50 per cent or higher selection rates) in the school administrator sample and the two measures correlate .87.

Actually, all of the conformity indexes are highly related, the lowest correlation between any two of these four measures being .74, yet they are not identical. Taken as a whole they provide rather comprehensive coverage of the possible definitions of the term conformity, insofar as this concept is intended to apply to uniformity of behavior in a group (Miner, 1965).

PART 2

Effectiveness of the Potential Predictors

Chapter 4

Age and Employment History

As noted in Chapter 3, age and employment history were introduced into the study primarily to determine whether they might represent a source of bias which should be controlled. It seemed likely that younger administrators might be valued more, but rewarded less. Thus, any correlation between a personality or ability variable and a criterion might in actuality reflect only the age-criterion relationship. Quite possibly a personality variable such as work motivation, for instance, might not prove to be the true cause of success even though the appropriate correlation was obtained. In order to determine whether this might be the case age-criterion correlations had to be computed and, if these were found significant, a correction for age differences introduced into the predictor-criterion relationships.

The same argument holds for in-district and out-district job changing. If changing position, either upward or laterally, within a district is valued, and changing employing districts is condemned, then these tendencies may well be reflected in the ratings and even in the reward structure. To that extent a given personality characteristic may not be the real cause of a particular rating; rather, a specific type of employment history which is correlated with the personality characteristic may be the cause. If a measure of the predictor-criterion relationship independent of the impact of employment history on the criterion measures is desired, then this bias factor must be partialed out.

As Table 7 indicates, there are some differences among the districts with regard to the variables under consideration. In the case of age, the administrators of Consolidated District are clearly younger than those in the other three districts. The total rate of job changing in the

Table 7: Mean Ages and Values for Employment History Variables in Total Sample and in Each District

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Age	45.9	47.0	46.7	46.5	42.3	3.19	<.05
Total Job Changes per year	.153	.142	.178	.123	.170	5.35	<.01
In-District Changes per year	.070	.075	.060	.065	.083	1.78	—
Out-District Changes per year	.083	.067	.118	.058	.087	6.84	<.01

Significant Comparisons—Age	t	P
Consolidated District vs.		
Large City	3.13	<.01
Medium City	2.77	<.01
Small City	2.43	<.01
Significant Comparisons—Total Job Changes per year		
Medium City vs.		
Large City	2.06	<.05
Small City	3.20	<.01
Consolidated District vs.		
Large City	1.74	<.05
Small City	2.77	<.01
Significant Comparisons—Out-District Changes per year		
Medium City vs.		
Large City	3.58	<.01
Small City	5.00	<.01
Consolidated District	1.96	<.05

past is relatively high for the Medium City and Consolidated District administrators; relatively low for those in Large City and Small City. At least in the case of Medium City it is apparent that this high rate of job changing is accounted for by the large number of out-district changes per year characterizing this particular group of administrators. On the other hand, neither Consolidated District nor any of the others shows any particular tendency for out- or in-district changing to predominate.

Data relevant to the hypotheses under consideration are contained in Tables 8 and 9. Taking the age data for the total sample first, the expected tendency for younger administrators to be rated higher does appear; not only is it evident in the case of the potential rating, where the relationship is quite pronounced, but with all the value indexes. Similarly the hypothesis that older administrators will be at higher grade levels and paid more is also confirmed.

Among the individual districts, the overall tendency to value youth but reward age is clearly characteristic in Large City and Consolidated District. In Medium City one of the correlations drops slightly below accepted significance levels but the general trend of the data is the same. Small City, by contrast, turns out to be somewhat of a maverick insofar as the age correlations are concerned. The value indexes do not yield significant relationships consistently, although the negative trend is still present. The failure to achieve significance occurs, however, only with the scores to which the six performance and attitude items contribute. With the Potential and Innovation ratings rather sizeable correlations are obtained. Overall, one could hardly say that youth is definitely not valued in Small City. But one can say age is not rewarded. There is nothing to indicate that higher level positions and larger salaries have been bestowed upon the older administrators. This was a rather unexpected finding. As will become clear, however, there are other factors which tend to make this particular district somewhat different from the others.

In establishing acceptable significance levels for the individual districts a one-tailed test has been used in the case of age. This seems appropriate because the direction of the correlations had already been clearly fixed from the combined data for the total sample.

Since the fact of a consistent age bias in both the value and reward indexes has been established, it becomes necessary to control for this factor in all subsequent analyses. In order to do this, the correlations have been computed with the age factor partialed out. In the ensuing tables all predictor-criterion coefficients are presented. Then, when one of these achieves an accepted level of significance, the partial correlation is presented immediately following in parentheses. In addition, all partial correlations which themselves attain significance are also presented in parenthesis. Thus, it is possible to determine what effect the correction for age has in all cases where either the uncorrected or the corrected values achieve minimum significance.

Turning now to those aspects of Tables 8 and 9 dealing with employment history, a somewhat different picture emerges. In the total sample

Table 8: Correlations Between Age and Employment History Variables and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score	Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation
Total Sample							
Age	—.30	—.31	—.33	—.33	—.46	—.28	—.32
Total Job Changes per year	.14(.09)	.08	.10	.12	.24(.18)	.14(.09)	.15(.11)
In-District Changes per year	.15(.03)	.16(.04)	.17(.06)	.19(.08)	.30(.13)	.12(.01)	.18(.07)
Out-District Changes per year	.01	—.05	—.03	.01	.04	.05	.04
				P .05=±.14 P .01=±.19			
Large City							
Age	—.42	—.40	—.42	—.45	—.55	—.28	—.26
Total Job Changes per Year	.16	.15	.14	.09	.16	.02	.05
In-District Changes per Year	.20	.21	.21	.18	.25(.10)	.13	.07
Out-District Changes per Year	.00	—.03	—.04	—.06	—.05	—.08	—.02
	Age:	P .05=—.20 P .01=—.28		Job Changes:	P .05=±.24 P .01=±.31		

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score	Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation
Medium City							
Age	—.22	—.29	—.26	—.20	—.34	—.32	—.34
Total Job Changes per Year	.03	.00	.04	.17	.28(.20)	.17	.21
In-District Changes per Year	.06	.09	.09	.13	.18	.13	.06
Out-District Changes per Year	.01	—.04	.00	.13	.21	.11	.20
Age:	P .05=—.22 P .01=—.31			Job Changes:	P .05=±.27 P .01=±.35		
Small City							
Age	—.16	—.17	—.20	—.26	—.42	—.25	—.40
Total Job Changes per Year	.30(.33)	.18	.17	.20	.26	.14	.12
In-District Changes per Year	.24	.25	.25	.25	.32(.14)	—.03	.27
Out-District Changes per Year	.04	—.05	—.06	—.04	—.04	.11	—.10
Age:	P .05=—.25 P .01=—.35			Job Changes:	P .05=±.30 P .01=±.39		
Consolidated District							
Age	—.44	—.42	—.47	—.45	—.63	—.38	—.36
Total Job Changes per Year	.11	.02	.08	.17	.38(.38)	.23	.23
In-District Changes per Year	.21	.19	.23	.26	.51(.30)	.32	.37(.25)
Out-District Changes per Year	—.10	—.20	—.15	—.08	—.08	—.05	—.11
Age:	P .05=—.28 P .01=—.39			Job Changes:	P .05=±.33 P .01=±.42		

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Table 9: Correlations Between Age and Employment History Variables and Indexes of Organizational Reward

	Grade Level	Salary
Total Sample		
Age	.32	.40
Total Job Changes per Year	.16(.22)	.01
In-District Changes per Year	.00(.14)	—.10
Out-District Changes per Year	.18(.14)	.07
	P .05=±.14	
	P .01=±.19	
Large City		
Age	.43	.54
Total Job Changes per Year	.27(.30)	.21(.26)
In-District Changes per Year	.02	—.07
Out-District Changes per Year	.23	.26(.17)
Age: P .05=+.20	Job Changes: P .05=±.24	
P .01=+.28	P .01=±.31	
Medium City		
Age	.34	.53
Total Job Changes per Year	—.02	—.20
In-District Changes per Year	—.21	—.30(—.19)
Out-District Changes per Year	.08	—.09
Age: P .05=+.22	Job Changes: P .05=±.27	
P .01=+.31	P .01=±.35	
Small City		
Age	.09	.04
Total Job Changes per Year	.39(.42)	.35(.35)
In-District Changes per Year	.26(.33)	.22
Out-District Changes per Year	.15	.14
Age: P .05=+.25	Job Changes: P .05=±.30	
P .01=+.35	P .01=±.39	
Consolidated District		
Age	.35	.41
Total Job Changes per Year	.31.(40)	.22
In-District Changes per Year	.07	—.18
Out-District Changes per Year	.30	.46(.41)
Age: P .05=+.28	Job Changes: P .05=±.33	
P .01=+.39	P .01=±.42	

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

there is a consistent tendency for individuals with a higher rate of in-district change to be rated higher, and this factor appears to account for the fact that a number of the correlations between Total Job Changes per Year and value indexes are also significant. On the other hand the hypothesized negative relationships involving out-of-district changes do not materialize.

With the exception of the coefficients based on the Potential criterion, the significant correlations are consistently rather low. Furthermore, when age differences are partialed out, all the correlations that were previously significant, except one, drop below the minimum level. Thus, in correcting for age, a correction for employment history is achieved as well. The only correlation which remains significant indicates that those who have changed jobs at the most rapid rate, and this includes promotions, have the greatest potential for future promotion. This is hardly an unexpected finding. All in all, there is little evidence that the in-district vs. out-district change variable represents a major bias in the total sample insofar as the indexes of organizational value are concerned.

When the reward criteria in the total sample are considered, a major difficulty arises because the job change variable reflects promotions in part and so, of course, does Grade Level. Thus, some correlation is to be expected, although the fact that one variable involves *rate* of grade increase and the other the *total increase* achieved would tend to reduce the size of the relationship. The results of Table 9 are as expected, especially when the age correction is applied. Yet under these latter circumstances there is nothing to indicate an in-district vs. out-district differential; job change, irrespective of where it occurs, is the crucial variable. When the rather unexpected lack of any significant relationships involving salary is considered also, there is little reason to suspect a bias in the reward area any more than with regard to the ratings.

In the individual districts deviations from the total sample pattern insofar as indexes of organizational values are concerned are minimal. In Large City and Medium City a single minimally significant correlation does emerge, but in both cases a sizeable decrease occurs when age is partialed out. In Small City there is one minimally significant correlation which disappears in a similar manner, but another does hold up. Yet this is hardly sufficient evidence to support the bias hypothesis, especially in view of the fact that only the Total Job Changes per Year variable is involved. Consolidated District yields a somewhat different picture. It is here that the major contributions to the total sample correlations involving Potential occur. Total Job Changes per Year is the only variable which still yields a significant relationship when the partial correlation is computed, but it is evident that in-district change is the major contributor to this result. Thus, in Consolidated District it does seem appropriate to conclude that a history of frequent job changes, primarily within an employing district, does contribute to the belief that an individual has a high potential for advancement.

The reward indexes produce somewhat different results when the breakdown by district is carried out. In Large City, Total Job Changes per Year is correlated with Grade Level, and Salary too. This is to be expected. But, after the partial correlations are computed, no clear evidence remains to support the view that either an in-district or an out-district bias exists. In Medium City the age correction eliminates the one significant correlation.

Small City represents the only case where a tendency to reward in-district changing exists to a significant degree. The Total Job Changes per Year correlations are sizeable for both Grade Level and Salary, and the in-district variable is the major contributor. On the other hand, just the opposite trend appears in Consolidated District. Here it is out-district changing which is the primary source of reward.

In view of the fact that the total sample correlations involving both value and reward indexes did not yield a consistent pattern of significance after age-effects were removed, the individual district correlations were tested using both ends of the distribution. There was no basis for an explicit statement regarding the direction of these correlations.

When the overall data were supplemented with those from the district analysis, there seemed little reason to correct for an employment history bias. Certainly no consistent pattern emerges across districts. Thus, partial correlations have been computed only to correct for age differences. Employment history corrections have not been employed in computing the correlations which follow.

Chapter 5

Verbal Ability

As noted previously, the only ability measure employed in the study was a brief vocabulary test. The research was designed primarily to investigate relationships involving personality variables, and for this reason moving more intensively into the ability area seemed inappropriate. Some indication of the value and reward attached to general intelligence by the various districts did seem desirable, however.

Table 10: Mean Vocabulary Score in Total Sample and in Each District

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Vocabulary Test	29.1	30.3	30.1	27.1	27.9	8.46	<.01

Significant Comparisons	t	P
Large City vs.		
Small City	4.29	<.01
Consolidated District	3.09	<.01
Medium City vs.		
Small City	3.55	<.01
Consolidated District	2.53	<.01

Table 10 contains the mean scores for the four districts. There are some highly reliable differences. Large City and Medium City appear to have a considerably higher general level of intelligence than the other two districts. The implication that larger districts are somewhat more able to attract administrators of high intelligence seems inescapable, even though salary differences cannot entirely account for this situation.

Table 11: Mean Vocabulary Score on Form A in the School Districts and in Various Comparison Groups

	Mean Score	N
Total Sample	14.0	219
Large City	14.6	82
Medium City	14.3	57
Small City	12.9	44
Consolidated District	13.4	36
College Graduates	14.7	84
Professionals—Census Classification	14.6	68
Pacific Coast	11.8	153
35-54 Age Group	11.4	489
U.S. Population	10.8	1500

Comparison data are available only for Form A of the vocabulary test (the first 20 items). These are presented in Table 11, along with the Form A means derived in the present study. The comparison data derive from the administration of Form A to a national sample of the U. S. Population aged 10 and above (Miner, 1957). The college graduate classification includes individuals with graduate degrees. The professional grouping is based on the 1950 Census system of categori-

Table 12: Correlations Between Vocabulary Score and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score	Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation
Total Sample							
Vocabulary Test	.01	—.01	—.02	.07(.16)	.06(.19)	.18(.26)	.08(.16)
					P .05=.14 P .01=.19		
Large City							
Vocabulary Test	—.04	—.11	—.08	—.07	.10	.13	.12
					P .05=.24 P .01=.31		
Medium City							
Vocabulary Test	.00	.00	.00	.05	.10	.10	.06
					P .05=.27 P .01=.35		
Small City							
Vocabulary Test	.22	.12	.15	.21	.16	.53(.59)	.10
					P .05=.30 P .01=.39		
Consolidated District							
Vocabulary Test	.07	.09	.07	.11	—.10	.13	.08
					P .05=.33 P .01=.42		

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

zation. The Pacific Coast grouping includes all individuals tested in California, Washington, and Oregon, the most relevant geographical area for comparison purposes. The 35-54 age group includes all individuals from the population sample in this age range; most of the administrators fall within these same limits. The total population figure is based on a sample which checks out against census data on eight variables: education, sex, marital status, age, race, occupational status, city size, and geographical area.

In terms of these comparison statistics the school administrators do not score particularly high as a group. The standard deviation for the population data is 3.5. Thus, the school administrators are less than a full standard deviation above the national average. They are below the averages for both the college graduates and the professionals.

Table 13. Correlations Between Vocabulary Score and Indexes of Organizational Reward

	Grade Level	Salary
Total Sample		
Vocabulary Test	.15(.08)	.07
	P .05=.14 P .01=.19	
Large City		
Vocabulary Test	.30(.27)	.28(.25)
	P .05=.24 P .01=.31	
Medium City		
Vocabulary Test	.08	.09
	P .05=.27 P .01=.35	
Small City		
Vocabulary Test	—.15	—.15
	P .05=.30 P .01=.39	
Consolidated District		
Vocabulary Test	.14	.19
	P .05=.33 P .01=.42	

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Overall, they are less than two-thirds of a standard deviation above the mean scores both for their geographical area and for their age group. In view of the educational level attained (probably averaging at about the masters level) and the positions these individuals hold in the community, these findings were rather unexpected.

Overall, there is relatively little evidence to indicate that verbal ability is valued in the school districts (Table 12). Significance is attained with the Overall, Potential, Creativity, and Innovation ratings when age corrections are applied, but except for Creativity the correlations are low and they do not achieve significance in the individual districts. In the case of Creativity it is clear that the total sample results reflect primarily the very striking relationship in Small City. In this particular district intelligence and creative tendencies appear to be viewed as very similar characteristics. The data do not permit a definite conclusion that intelligence is more generally valued in this school system, however, although the ratings do consistently yield correlations above the level obtained in the other three districts.

In the case of the reward variables (Table 13) only Large City produces significant results. The administrators at the top of the hierarchy and those who are paid the most are the most inteligent. This district is also the one with the highest average intelligence level. Although the data do not provide conclusive proof on this point, they do suggest that a major factor contributing to the relatively low intelligence levels of the people attracted to school administration is the failure to reward this factor. When one of the districts does provide rewards in this area, higher ability levels are obtained.

Chapter 6

Managerial Motivation

The managerial motivation measure has been employed rather extensively in studies of a variety of groups. As a result, considerable information is available for comparison purposes. In this connection it is important to keep in mind that although the Miner Sentence Completion Scale was originally constructed to measure the extent of motivation to meet various role requirements of the managerial job as it exists in hierarchically structured organizations, it also reflects in many of its subscales a desire to compete for and exercise power. This motive is probably most pronounced in the Imposing Wishes measure, but it appears to permeate the other subscales as well, with the possible exception of Authority Figures.

Table 14: Mean Values for Managerial Motivation Measures in Total Sample and in Each District

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Item Score	1.51	1.47	1.77	1.27	1.34	.08	....
Rare Score	.01	— .32	.21	.02	.26	1.00	....
Authority Figures	1.54	1.48	1.63	1.80	1.46	.70	....
Competitive Games	.69	.89	.79	.41	.66	.58	....
Competitive Situations	— .79	— .65	— .88	— .80	— .86	.19	....
Masculine Role	— .16	— .24	— .02	— .29	— .29	.32	....
Imposing Wishes	— .42	— .48	— .40	— .46	— .34	.08	....
Standing Out from Group	.58	.48	.54	.71	.66	.26	....
Routine Administrative Functions	.06	.00	.11	— .10	.06	.11	....

As Table 14 indicates, the school administrators are rather strikingly homogeneous insofar as the managerial motivation variables are concerned. In no case does anything approaching a significant F value

Table 15: Mean Values for Managerial Motivation Measures in Total Sample of School Administrators and Various Comparison Groups

	School Administrators (N=219)	Corporate Managers (N=160)	Department Store Supervisors (N=70)	Graduate Students in Educational Admin. (N=57)
Item Score	1.51	5.39	4.47	3.09
Authority Figures	1.54	1.13	1.86	1.14
Competitive Games	.69	1.41	1.03	1.31
Competitive Situations	— .79	— .24	— .51	— .75
Masculine Role	— .16	.43	.47	.07
Imposing Wishes	— .42	.81	.23	.16
Standing Out from Group	.58	1.04	.51	.72
Routine Administrative Functions	.06	.79	.89	.44

emerge from the comparisons between districts. In fact, the mean scores are so consistent from district to district that there seems to be considerable justification for generalizing the total sample figures to a much larger school administrator population.

Certain comparison statistics are presented in Table 15. The corporate manager data derive from a single large corporation. A great variety of areas of activity and all levels of management below the vice-presidential are represented. The department store supervisors were employed in a single store and include all individuals at the managerial level. Many are women. Both groups are discussed in greater detail in a prior publication (Miner, 1965). The graduate students were enrolled in the School of Education at the University of Oregon; all had indicated a clear preference for administrative careers in the field of education (Miner, in press). Rare Scores are not presented in Table 15 because the norms used in obtaining this index for the business groups differ from those used with the education samples, thus making comparisons inappropriate.

There are no reliable differences between the mean scores for the graduate students and for the practicing administrators. Thus, once again the homogeneity of the school administrator group is demonstrated.

On the other hand the total sample Item Score mean is well below those for the two business groups. In the subscale comparison involving the corporate managers the latter are significantly above the school administrators in all cases but Authority Figures, where a significant reversal of the general subscale trend occurs ($t = 2.81$, $P < .01$). The administrator-manager difference is greatest in the case of Imposing Wishes, the subscale most directly related to power motivation ($t = 8.15$). The t value in this case is at least double those obtained with the other subscales, where the range is from 3.13 to 4.08. In general, the department store managers do not represent as striking a comparison group, but many of the same trends appear. Only in the case of Authority Figures and Standing Out from Group are the differences between the school administrators and the corporate managers completely obliterated.

These findings suggest an interesting hypothesis which unfortunately requires much more research to test adequately. If business managers, who may be presumed to have strong economic values, serve on a school board, they are very likely to come in conflict with school administrators, whose values can be expected to be more social in nature.

Should this situation arise, and presumably it often does, there is a high probability that the business managers will exert the greater influence as a result of their more pronounced need to exercise power. Thus, it is hypothesized that a major factor contributing to the difficulties that school administrators often have in establishing a voice in the community and gaining acceptance for their programs is the relative lack of power motivation characterizing this group.

The rating criteria, the indexes of organizational value, yield considerable evidence supporting the hypotheses involving the Miner Sentence Completion Scale. The data of Table 16 (pages 40-43) indicate that managerial motivation generally is valued and in particular a favorable attitude toward authority figures, competitiveness as reflected in the Competitive Situations measure, a desire to assume the masculine role, and a preference for standing out from a group. The correlations are not high, but they do retain significance when the age correction is applied. In the case of Creativity and Innovation the pattern breaks down somewhat, but otherwise it is consistent across all rating variables. There can be little doubt that managerial motivation as measured by the sentence completion scale is valued rather widely.

In view of the consistency of the findings obtained with the overall measures and certain of the subscales in the total sample, a one-tailed test has been used with much of the district data. The total sample figures do not permit any certainty regarding the direction of the correlations involving Competitive Games, Imposing Wishes, and Routine Administrative Functions, however. Thus, the two-tailed hypothesis has been retained with these subscales.

Although all four districts consistently yield positive correlations between both overall scores and the ratings (except Creativity and Innovation), only the Large City values are significant. The correlations obtained in this one district, however, are rather sizeable, especially in view of the limited reliability of the criterion measures. They are certainly comparable to those found in business organizations. It may well be that these results reflect some general characteristic of the value structures existing in relatively large bureaucracies, whether of an administrative or a professional nature.

Yet the findings even in Large city do not entirely fit the business pattern. In the business organizations Authority Figures, Competitive Situations, and Imposing Wishes consistently proved to be the best predictors (Miner, 1965). In Large City, Authority Figures does yield some significant results, but the general picture is not impressive.

Table 16: Correlations Between Managerial Motivation Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Item Score			
Total Sample	.24(.23)	.25(.24)	.26(.24)
Large City	.39(.41)	.35(.36)	.40(.42)
Medium City	.11	.11	.14
Small City	.16	.23	.23
Consolidated District	.15	.20	.16
Rare Score			
Total Sample	.17(.17)	.19(.19)	.20(.20)
Large City	.34(.38)	.35(.38)	.38(.42)
Medium City	.09	.06	.12
Small City	.03	.15	.13
Consolidated District	.09	.12	.09
Authority Figures			
Total Sample	.18(.21)	.15(.18)	.17(.20)
Large City	.13(.20)	.07	.11
Medium City	.23(.22)	.23(.21)	.23(.21)
Small City	.27(.27)	.16	.19
Consolidated District	.09	.08	.07
Competitive Games			
Total Sample	.08	.09	.10
Large City	.30(.29)	.24(.22)	.29(.27)
Medium City	—.08	—.12	—.08
Small City	.03	.19	.09
Consolidated District	—.03	.00	—.02
Competitive Situations			
Total Sample	.17(.13)	.19(.15)	.21(.16)
Large City	.30(.27)	.29(.25)	.31(.28)
Medium City	—.03	—.02	—.01
Small City	.17	.25(.24)	.26(.25)
Consolidated District	.21	.25	.26
Masculine Role			
Total Sample	.19(.19)	.22(.22)	.19(.19)
Large City	.35(.30)	.36(.32)	.36(.31)
Medium City	.22(.28)	.28(.36)	.26(.33)
Small City	.07	.09	.08
Consolidated District	.01	—.01	—.04
Imposing Wishes			
Total Sample	—.01	.02	.00
Large City	—.06	.02	—.01
Medium City	—.11	—.12	—.10
Small City	.21	.25	.22
Consolidated District	.08	.09	.07

				Organizational Reward	
Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
.23(.21)	.22(.20)	.10	.15(.14)	.03	.00
.39(.42)	.28(.31)	.13	.21(.21)	.16	.22(.29)
.03	.09	—.12	—.01	.05	—.04
.24	.24	.19	.18	—.10	—.08
.17	.19	.12	.15	—.14	—.18
.17(.17)	.15(.15)	.05	.11	—.02	—.07
.33(.37)	.22(.26)	.04	.11	.04	.10
.00	.09	.04	.06	.01	—.06
.13	.15	.07	.08	—.06	—.13
.10	.07	.02	.12	—.13	—.21
.12(.15)	.09	.11(.14)	.12(.19)	.02	—.02
.12	—.01	.10	.22(.26)	.03	.01
.07	.26(.24)	.13	.04	.06	—.02
.10	.09	.06	.38(.42)	—.05	—.10
.08	—.01	.06	.02	.03	.05
.12	.09	.02	.08	.03	—.06
.24(.23)	.17	.14	.17	.07	.06
—.04	—.02	—.25(—.32)	—.10	.16	.05
.14	—.01	.14	.02	—.25	—.25
.06	.13	.05	.09	—.12	—.22
.22(.18)	.21(.15)	.07	.12	—.05	—.07
.36(.34)	.33(.30)	.13	.12	.05	.14
—.06	—.08	—.08	.02	—.22	—.33(—.23)
.27(.26)	.29(.29)	.14	.23	.09	.15
.22	.23	.02	.09	—.04	—.17
.20(.20)	.20(.20)	.15(.15)	.10	.09	.04
.32(.27)	.26(.19)	.18	.22(.18)	.04	.04
.23(.28)	.25(.34)	.15(.24)	.23(.32)	.20	.13
.09	.16	.07	—.15	—.10	—.16
.05	.11	.05	—.03	.05	.17
—.04	—.04	—.10	—.06	.00	—.07
—.06	—.09	—.23	—.23	.15	.09
—.17	—.17	—.19	—.20	—.07	—.07
.25	.29	.06	.15	—.13	—.19
.02	—.11	.04	.08	.04	—.15

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Standing Out from Group			
Total Sample	.15(.15)	.13	.17(.16)
Large City	.26(.26)	.17	.23(.21)
Medium City	.13	.09	.13
Small City	.09	.08	.17
Consolidated District	.07	.13	.08
Routine Administrative Functions			
Total Sample	—.01	.01	—.01
Large City	.03	.01	.04
Medium City	—.04	—.02	—.02
Small City	—.21	—.22	—.19
Consolidated District	.19	.25	.19

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Organizational Value

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*
P .05=.14	Item Score	Item Score
P .01=.19	Rare Score	Rare Score
	Authority Figures	Authority Figures
	Competitive Situations	Competitive Situations
	Masculine Role	Masculine Role
	Standing Out from Group	Standing Out from Group
	P .05=+.20	P .05=+.22
	P .01=+.28	P .01=+.31
	Competitive Games	Competitive Games
	Imposing Wishes	Imposing Wishes
	Routine Administrative Functions	Routine Administrative Functions
	P .05=±.24	P .05=±.27
	P .01=±.31	P .01=±.35

Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
.16(.13)	.21(.20)	.10	.11	—.01	.04
.21(.19)	.25(.24)	.15	.19	.00	.11
.07	.11	—.12	—.01	.11	.11
.20	.19	.24	.10	—.07	—.01
.04	.25	.03	.11	—.22	—.11
.02	—.03	—.01	.02	.05	.10
.05	—.04	—.07	—.01	.30(.22)	.31(.21)
—.09	—.07	.10	—.09	—.10	.01
—.18	—.16	—.03	—.05	.16	.25
.23	.14	.20	.19	—.26	—.21

Small City
Item Score
Rare Score
Authority Figures
Competitive Situations
Masculine Role
Standing Out from Group
P .05=+.25
P .01=+.35

Competitive Games
Imposing Wishes
Routine Administrative Functions
P .05=±.30
P. .01=±.39

Consolidated District
Item Score
Rare Score
Authority Figures
Competitive Situations
Masculine Role
Standing Out from Group
P .05=+.28
P .01=+.39

Competitive Games
Imposing Wishes
Routine Administrative Functions
P .05=±.33
P .01=±.42

Organizational Reward

Total Sample
P .05=.14
P .01=.19

Large City
P .05=.24
P .01=.31

Medium City
P .05=.27
P .01=.35

Small City
P .05=.30
P .01=.39

Consolidated District
P .05=.33
P .01=.42

However, this subscale does achieve significance in the total sample and in two other districts (Medium and Small City). Competitive Situations is effective in Large City (and in Small City also), as it is in the business world. But Imposing Wishes, which has consistently produced very good validities among business managers, does not do so in the school districts. In fact, if there is any trend, it is in a negative direction. Once again, the lack of emphasis on power in the field of school administration is evident.

Turning to the other subscales, all of which have on occasion yielded significant correlations with criteria of business management success, the most striking findings involve Masculine Role and Standing Out from Group. Neither of these variables has proved consistently predictive in the business world; in fact, they are clearly the weakest subscales in the test in that context. Yet in the school districts they do rather well. Masculine Role yields significant results in both Large City and Medium City; Standing Out from Group in Large City only, but it approaches significance in two other instances.

Competitive Games is clearly significant in Large City, even when the two-tailed test is applied, but the original uncertainty regarding the direction of such relationships in successive samples is reinforced by the unique finding of a negative partial correlation with Creativity in Medium City. Since, however, this is the only negative correlation between a Miner Sentence Completion Scale variable and an organizational value index which attains significance, it would be inappropriate to place undue emphasis on this result.

Although most of the rating variables are rather consistently related to one or another of the managerial motivation measures, this is not entirely true of Creativity and Innovation. In fact, the significant results involving Creativity are so few and so marginal when they do occur, that it seems appropriate to conclude that no real relationship has been demonstrated in this area. On the other hand, Innovation does seem to yield significance, especially with Authority Figures and Masculine Role. The former produces sizeable correlations in Large City and Small City; the latter in Large City and Medium City.

In contrast to the value indexes, the reward measures yield very little by way of significant results. Although various aspects of managerial motivation are consistently valued in three of the four districts, it is evident from Table 16 that they are not rewarded. There are in fact almost as many negative correlations as there are positive.

The only instance of a significant relationship which does not drop below the minimum acceptance level when the age correction is applied, occurs in Large City. Here the Item Score vs. Salary partial correlation is reliable. In view of the fact that neither the Grade Level criterion, nor any of the subscales, yield support for this finding, it is probably not appropriate to give it a great deal of weight. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the district which places the most value on managerial motivation is also the only one which yields a positive trend when the reward indexes are used as criteria.

Chapter 7

Work Motivation

Unfortunately, comparison data are not available for the work motivation, social motivation, and inner life cathexis measures derived from the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test. The specific approach to the measurement process used in connection with this research has not been employed in other studies to date. Thus, it is not possible to say whether the school administrators are particularly high or low on these variables.

The analysis by district presented in Table 18 (page 50) yields no evidence of any significant differences between means on the various work motivation variables, although Small City does rather consistently achieve the highest scores. Once again, as with managerial motivation, the school administrators emerge as homogeneous in personality makeup insofar as inter-district differences are concerned.

Although the overall trend of the total sample correlations in Table 17 (pages 46-49) tends to suggest a positive value placed on work motivation, the number of significant correlations is not large and those that do emerge are low. In the individual districts, however, a more promising picture does emerge. There is no question that work motivation in general is valued in Small City. The Item Score correlations are consistently positive and significant, rising to as high as .46. In one instance a Rare Score value achieves significance also. Although generally there is no basis for concluding that any particular subscale contributes to this overall result, it does appear that strong Work Motivation Where Prob-

Table 17: Correlations Between Work Motivation Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Item Score			
Total Sample	.14(.14)	.10	.10
Large City	.10	.06	.08
Medium City	.10	.09	.08
Small City	.43(.46)	.39(.41)	.34(.37)
Consolidated District	—.10	—.13	—.10
Rare Score			
Total Sample	.05	.02	.03
Large City	—.10	—.14	—.10
Medium City	.21	.19	.15
Small City	.25	.21	.22
Consolidated District	—.16	—.16	—.14
Where Passivity is Possible			
Total Sample	.00	—.03	—.02
Large City	—.06	—.11	—.02
Medium City	.09	.12	.07
Small City	.15	.08	.03
Consolidated District	—.16	—.18	—.17
Where Passivity is Not Possible			
Total Sample	.07	.03	.06
Large City	.14	.03	.13
Medium City	.01	.03	.01
Small City	.26	.27	.26
Consolidated District	—.21	—.22	—.19
Where Leaving is Possible			
Total Sample	.11	.08	.08
Large City	.08	.11	.08
Medium City	.13	.06	.10
Small City	.05	.00	—.03
Consolidated District	.21	.17	.22
Where Problems are Present			
Total Sample	.01	—.01	.01
Large City	—.11	—.16	—.06
Medium City	.02	.08	.03
Small City	.34(.38)	.24	.24
Consolidated District	—.13	—.12	—.12
Where Distractions are Present			
Total Sample	.10	.10	.10
Large City	.05	—.04	.05
Medium City	.18	.21	.18
Small City	.19	.27	.20
Consolidated District	—.01	—.03	—.04

				Organizational Reward	
Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
.14(.14)	.13	.06	.10	—.19(—.19)	—.10
.08	.19	.18	.14	—.15	—.06
.22	.06	—.06	.09	—.13	—.08
.26	.21	.33(.35)	.35(.42)	—.34(—.35)	—.30(—.31)
.01	.01	—.26	—.22	—.15	—.06
.05	.06	.10	.02	—.02	.02
—.16	.00	.11	.00	—.15	—.12
.28(.31)	.19	.18	.11	.18	.20
.16	.13	.30(.31)	.15	—.16	—.09
—.05	—.12	—.19	—.18	—.04	—.12
.02	—.03	—.07	.01	—.10(—.15)	—.05
—.08	—.05	.00	.05	—.09	—.01
.29(.34)	.04	—.01	.13	—.09	—.07
.01	.00	—.01	.11	—.06	—.14
—.07	—.08	—.30(—.37)	—.26	—.15	—.11
.08	.12	.03	.05	—.01	.02
.09	.20	.22	.19	.00	.04
.11	.08	—.12	—.10	.12	.16
.13	.11	.05	.17	—.20	—.24
—.05	—.01	—.17	—.18	—.09	—.05
.05	.09	.05	.07	—.16(—.14)	—.12
.03	.15	.11	.05	—.17	—.19
.07	.05	.03	.17	—.19	—.19
—.04	—.03	.02	.08	—.17	—.10
.21	.20	—.01	—.03	.04	.08
.00	.00	.00	.01	—.05	—.03
—.14	—.04	.05	—.03	.04	.05
.08	.01	.06	.06	—.11	—.11
.17	.16	.01	.17	—.13	—.16
—.01	—.09	—.16	—.18	.02	.05
.14(.12)	.16(.14)	.07	.14(.12)	—.11	—.06
.02	.13	.21	.17	—.12	—.06
.30(.27)	.25	.01	.13	.03	.04
.16	.06	.01	.21	—.09	—.13
.11	.21	—.02	.03	—.37(—.37)	—.24

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Approach (Direct) to Work			
Total Sample	.10	.08	.09
Large City	.11	.08	.14
Medium City	.03	—.04	.01
Small City	.17	.18	.08
Consolidated District	.12	.12	.10
Approach (Indirect) to Work			
Total Sample	.02	.00	.03
Large City	—.03	—.08	—.02
Medium City	.05	.12	.04
Small City	.14	.08	.16
Consolidated District	—.15	—.19	—.15
Avoidance (Direct) of Work			
Total Sample	.01	.03	.03
Large City	.16	.17	.15
Medium City	—.12	—.13	—.12
Small City	—.18	—.11	—.08
Consolidated District	.13	.12	.11
Avoidance (Indirect) of Work			
Total Sample	—.05	.01	—.03
Large City	—.21	—.13	—.24(—.12)
Medium City	—.03	.01	.01
Small City	—.04	.02	.07
Consolidated District	.24	.32	.27

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Organizational Value

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

2nd g

Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
.10	.06	—.01	.06	—.04	—.02
.08	.15	.15	.12	—.05	—.02
.07	—.06	—.21	—.10	.00	—.06
.05	.02	—.04	.19	—.02	—.10
.25	.13	.04	.03	.01	.07
—.01	.04	.08	.06	—.19(—.19)	—.13
—.07	.07	.23	.21	—.18	—.09
.05	.05	.10	.11	—.15	—.09
.06	.04	.08	.01	—.30(—.32)	—.26
—.13	—.06	—.32(—.34)	—.30	—.19	—.11
.06	.07	.06	.05	.12(.18)	.02
.23	.18	.15....	.19	.09	.05
—.16	.01	—.10	—.22(—.27)	.03	—.11
—.04	—.06	—.12	—.08	.25	.13
.10	.11	.31(.40)	.26	.17	.06
—.11	—.16(—.12)	.00	—.10	—.05	—.09
—.25(—.13)	—.32(—.17)	—.29(—.20)	—.33(—.23)	.05	.02
—.23	—.17	.12	.05	—.24	—.34(—.33)
.10	.09	.16	—.15	—.14	.07
.12	—.05	.29	.22	.20	.17

Organizational Reward

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

Table 18: Mean Values for Work Motivation Measures in Total Sample and in Each District.

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Item Score	— .93	—1.50	—1.19	— .13	— .55	.61	....
Rare Score	.01	— .19	— .17	.34	.26	1.83	....
Where Passivity is Possible	— .17	— .10	— .50	— .02	.00	.51	....
Where Passivity is Not Possible	—1.41	—1.70	—1.32	—1.07	—1.43	.87	....
Where Leaving is Possible	— .26	— .54	— .31	— .02	.06	1.28	....
Where Problems are Present	— .29	— .37	— .35	.10	— .51	.70	....
Where Distractions are Present	—2.14	—2.30	—2.17	—1.73	—2.29	.79	....
Approach (Direct) to Work	3.77	3.63	3.54	4.00	4.11	1.05	....
Approach (Indirect) to Work	1.49	1.30	1.63	1.68	1.37	1.29	....
Avoidance (Direct) of Work	3.41	3.60	3.38	3.10	3.46	.77	....
Avoidance (Indirect) of Work	2.80	2.83	2.98	2.71	2.57	.88	....

lems are Present is associated with a high Performance Score.

The pattern in Medium City is somewhat different. Here the crucial criterion measure appears to be the Overall Evaluation. Where Passivity is Possible and Where Distractions are Present both combine to produce a significant Rare Score value. Put in more specific terms these results suggest that a compulsive tendency to overcome distractions, including the lure of passivity, is highly valued in this district; that work generated out of a sense of guilt is considered desirable in an overall sense.

Consolidated District yields significant results only in the case of Creativity, although other rating variables show similar trends. It is clear that approach motivation insofar as work is concerned is a negative factor here. The less time and effort devoted to work tasks the better the administrator is felt to be. In contrast to these unique patterns characterizing Small City, Medium City, and Consolidated District, Large City appears to be rather devoid of relationships. Those significant correlations between Avoidance of Work and the value indexes which do appear are erased when the partial values are computed.

On the reward side the overall trend is just the reverse of that obtained generally with the value indexes. In the total sample the correlations consistently indicate that approach motivation insofar as work is concerned tends to go unrewarded. In five instances, all involving the Grade Level criterion, statistical significance is obtained. There is a clear tendency for low levels of work motivation to characterize those at the top of the hierarchy, even when age differences are taken into account. This tendency is most pronounced in Small City, the same district where work motivation is so highly valued (the largest Item Score correlation with value indexes is .46; with reward indexes —.35).

In the other districts the reward variables produce relatively little by way of significant results. Large City yields nothing; Medium City some tendency to penalize avoidance of work; Consolidated District a tendency not to reward a compulsive need to work when distractions are present.

All in all, although work motivation does not emerge as an extremely important factor in administrative success, there is a definite tendency to place positive value on it, while bestowing the rewards that a school system has to offer on those who are lacking in this regard. Such inconsistency must inevitably be rather confusing to those who look upward in the hierarchy as they begin their careers.

Chapter 8

Social Motivation

If anything the districts are even more homogeneous with regard to social motivation than in the work motivation area. The results of **Table 20** are strikingly consistent. Once again the need for comparison data is apparent. But this must await further research on other groups.

The total sample findings in **Table 19** (pages 52-55) are clear-cut.

Table 19: Correlations Between Social Motivation Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Item Score			
Total Sample	—.03	—.01	—.04
Large City	—.12	—.04	—.12
Medium City	—.03	—.04	—.02
Small City	—.01	—.05	—.06
Consolidated District	.10	.12	.08
Rare Score			
Total Sample	.06	.06	.07
Large City	—.09	.00	—.08
Medium City	.14	.09	.14
Small City	.08	.01	.08
Consolidated District	.19	.18	.22
In Non-work Situation			
Total Sample	—.08	—.11	—.10
Large City	—.03	.01	—.03
Medium City	.01	—.04	—.01
Small City	—.09	—.15	—.15
Consolidated District	—.19	—.27	—.25
With Authority Figures			
Total Sample	.06	.10	.08
Large City	—.10	.03	—.08
Medium City	.17	.09	.15
Small City	—.06	.01	—.01
Consolidated District	.31(.38)	.33(.41)	.31(.41)
In Group Situation			
Total Sample	—.03	—.05	—.06
Large City	—.10	—.12	—.14
Medium City	—.06	.00	—.04
Small City	.01	—.07	—.04
Consolidated District	.01	.03	.00
Involving Close Proximity			
Total Sample	.00	.05	.01
Large City	—.11	.02	—.09
Medium City	—.01	—.02	—.02
Small City	.02	.04	.04
Consolidated District	.23	.22	.24
Involving Emotional Support			
Total Sample	.02	.02	—.01
Large City	—.16	—.07	—.14
Medium City	.08	.01	.06
Small City	.08	.04	—.01
Consolidated District	.13	.14	.12

				Organizational Reward	
Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
—.04	—.06	—.04	—.03	.02	.04
—.04	—.09	—.26(—.16)	—.12	.18	.21
—.07	—.01	.13	.13	—.03	.14
—.09	—.13	—.04	.07	—.14	—.18
.03	.01	—.06	.07	.00	—.21
.01	.03	.03	.10	.06	.05
.00	.01	—.11	—.07	.05	.12
—.03	.15	.06	.08	.12	.21
.00	—.08	.14	.30(.23)	—.09	—.11
.08	.00	.12	.12	.02	—.08
—.05	—.05	—.04	—.04	.00	.02
.04	.03	—.08	—.06	.24(.14)	.27(.10)
.02	.02	.12	.15	—.07	.07
—.13	—.20	.07	—.14	—.23	—.29
—.15	—.11	—.20	—.12	.03	—.05
.00	.02	—.02	.03	.00	.04
—.04	—.07	—.21	—.11	—.02	.01
—.15	.09	.06	.04	—.01	.07
—.01	—.02	.07	.14	—.13	—.05
.25(.33)	.12	.12	.13	.20	.05
—.08	—.10	—.07	.01	.03	—.05
—.10	—.12	—.22	—.10	.21	.17
—.16	—.14	.08	.04	—.07	—.02
—.08	—.16	—.06	.04	.08	—.04
—.03	.04	—.09	.08	—.16	—.31(—.34)
.00	.01	.00	.03	—.09	—.06
—.05	—.04	—.16	—.14	—.01	—.01
—.09	.02	.10	.19	—.05	.07
.07	.01	.18	.10	—.32(—.31)	—.21
.14	.10	.02	.11	—.17	—.22
—.05	.01	.04	.05	—.07	.04
—.05	—.08	—.11	—.03	.11	.19
—.05	.10	.08	.05	—.05	.13
—.12	.02	.16	.12	—.35(—.34)	—.28
.07	.00	.06	.07	.19	.00

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Approach (Direct) to Social Interaction			
Total Sample	—.02	.03	—.01
Large City	.03	.10	.04
Medium City	.06	.06	.07
Small City	—.18	—.13	—.15
Consolidated District	—.03	.01	—.03
Approach (Indirect) to Social Interaction			
Total Sample	—.07	—.09	—.09
Large City	—.22	—.18	—.23
Medium City	—.14	—.16	—.17
Small City	.11	.03	.07
Consolidated District	.14	.10	.11
Avoidance (Direct) of Social Interaction			
Total Sample	.03	.06	.04
Large City	.13	.09	.12
Medium City	.06	.19	.09
Small City	—.07	.02	—.01
Consolidated District	—.08	—.10	—.08
Avoidance (Indirect) of Social Interaction			
Total Sample	—.07	—.09	—.05
Large City	.01	—.04	.02
Medium City	—.23(—.27)	—.27(—.35)	—.24(—.31)
Small City	—.01	.01	.06
Consolidated District	—.10	—.08	—.07

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Organizational Value

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
—.03	—.02	—.09	—.01	.00	.03
.10	.04	—.26(—.22)	—.02	.02	.10
—.04	.07	.13	.17	—.04	.06
—.02	—.06	.00	—.22(—.34)	—.06	—.03
—.18	—.22	—.22	—.05	.02	—.09
—.10	—.12	.01	.01	—.06	—.03
—.13	—.21	—.06	—.11	.13	.11
—.26	—.19	—.02	.00	—.13	.02
—.12	—.13	.05	.12	—.34(—.35)	—.29(—.30)
.19	.24	.17	.17	—.01	—.15
.07	.08	.05	—.02	—.04	.04
.11	.08	.17	.13	—.18	—.15
.20	.14	.02	.06	—.03	—.05
—.01	.11	—.05	—.25	.03	.09
—.05	—.03	—.06	—.16	.14	.38(.39)
—.03	—.02	.01	—.03	—.07	—.10
—.02	.00	.07	.03	—.10	—.13
—.07	—.12	—.13	—.11	—.03	—.16
.07	.14	.03	.13	—.05	.10
—.13	—.11	.06	.07	—.15	—.15

Organizational Reward

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

Table 20: *Mean Values for Social Motivation Measures in Total Sample and in Each District*

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Item Score	2.01	1.83	2.36	2.11	1.77	.97	....
Rare Score	.24	.11	.64	.07	.06	1.53	....
In Non-Work Situation	.99	.64	.96	1.00	1.66	1.70	....
With Authority Figures	.70	.70	.75	.95	.31	.90	....
In Group Situation	.45	.37	.94	.10	.29	1.66	....
Involving Close Proximity	2.37	2.24	2.52	2.54	2.20	.81	....
Involving Emotional Support	.48	.25	.40	1.10	.29	1.62	....
Approach (Direct) to Social Interaction	4.28	4.22	4.40	4.42	4.06	.49	....
Approach (Indirect) to Social Interaction	1.08	1.08	1.19	1.05	.97	.33	....
Avoidance (Direct) of Social Interaction	2.15	2.27	2.06	2.34	1.83	1.71	....
Avoidance (Indirect) of Social Interaction	1.20	1.21	1.17	1.02	1.43	1.01	....

There is no evidence in support of the hypothesis. Indexes of organizational value are not correlated with the social interaction measures.

Yet there are some significant results in individual districts. Large City yields nothing, after the partial correlations are computed. Small City yields only one significant value, involving a negative relationship between direct approach motivation and Innovation, which is of dubious importance. But Medium City without doubt condemns avoidance of social interaction. The most striking finding, however, is in Consolidated District. Social interaction with authority figures is clearly valued —by those in positions of authority themselves. In this instance the correlations reported in the table appear to be underestimates. When one looks at the age-corrected values for individual ratings the figures rise to .45 and .46 (for Performance in Relation to Community, Effect on Attitudes in the Community, and Effect on Attitudes of the Students—Items 2, 5, and 6 on the Evaluation Form).

Once again, as Table 19 indicates, that which is valued by the school districts is not necessarily what is rewarded. The data for the total sample fail to achieve significance, as do those for Large City (after partial correlations are obtained) and Medium City. In Small City approach motivation in the social area tends to go largely unrewarded. This negative reward structure is most pronounced in the case of the subscales Involving Close Proximity and Involving Emotional Support. The latter of these, and to some degree the former also, reflects a strong tendency toward dependence on others. Thus, the reward structure of Small City seems to emphasize independence, even though the value structure does not.

In Consolidated District, on the other hand, where social interaction with authority figures is so highly valued, interaction with a group is the factor that is negatively correlated with reward. This anti-group emphasis appears to account in large part for the fact that direct avoidance of social relationships is rewarded.

Chapter 9

Inner Life Cathexis

Again, as with the other Picture Arrangement Test measures, the differences between districts are small. There is a trend in Consolidated District to emphasize thought and positive emotion, but not negative emotion, but it is only a trend. None of the F values in Table 22 (page 62) is significant.

Insofar as the total sample is concerned, the only consistent finding is the positive relationship between the indexes of organizational value and Direct Avoidance of Inner Life (Table 21, pages 58-61). Yet even here the correlations are not high and none of the individual districts exhibits the same trend to a significant degree.

In Large City one significant correlation remains after age is partialed out, but this is marginal. Small City yields nothing. The Item Score results in Medium City do, however, achieve significance. Inner Life is not valued there, primarily as a result of the negative onus placed on thought and unpleasant emotion. The other findings in this district involving Creativity and Innovation make no theoretical sense as such. In all likelihood they reflect a general tendency to value avoidance of inner life. In any event the correlations only barely attain significance.

Table 21: Correlations Between Inner Life Cathexis Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Item Score			
Total Sample	—.06	—.05	—.07
Large City	.04	.07	.02
Medium City	—.20	—.17	—.21
Small City	—.15	—.19	—.20
Consolidated District	.08	.11	.13
Rare Score			
Total Sample	—.06	—.06	—.08
Large City	—.13	—.13	—.15
Medium City	—.15	—.19	—.18
Small City	—.05	—.05	—.08
Consolidated District	.19	.22	.20
Thought			
Total Sample	—.01	—.01	—.03
Large City	.12	.14	.08
Medium City	—.20	—.20	—.22
Small City	—.04	—.02	—.06
Consolidated District	.09	.06	.11
Positive Emotion			
Total Sample	.01	.01	—.01
Large City	.14	.12	.11
Medium City	.15	.17	.15
Small City	—.23	—.25	—.29
Consolidated District	—.16	—.11	—.16
Negative Emotion			
Total Sample	—.05	—.04	—.03
Large City	—.25(—.25)	.21	—.20
Medium City	—.09	—.12	—.10
Small City	.13	.10	.13
Consolidated District	.23	.26	.27
Approach (Direct) to Inner Life			
Total Sample	—.04	—.04	—.05
Large City	.04	.08	.01
Medium City	—.02	—.06	—.05
Small City	—.22	—.27	—.25
Consolidated District	.00	.04	.04
Approach (Indirect) to Inner Life			
Total Sample	.01	.01	.01
Large City	—.01	—.06	—.03
Medium City	—.09	—.05	—.09
Small City	.10	.14	.09
Consolidated District	.08	.06	.14

				Organizational Reward	
Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
—.10	—.10(—.15)	—.05	—.07	.00	—.05
.07	.00	.07	.10	—.06	—.09
—.32(—.32)	—.32(—.32)	—.20	—.22	.06	.03
—.19	—.03	.00	—.10	—.24	—.21
—.01	.01	—.09	—.10	.16	.05
—.12	—.07	—.05	—.09	—.07	—.09
—.12	—.18	—.13	—.10	—.01	—.02
—.26	—.19	—.09	—.13	—.13	—.11
—.15	.08	.10	—.20	—.29	—.23
.10	.15	.03	.07	.07	—.07
—.02	—.05	—.02	—.01	.07	.02
.14	.13	.07	.19	.01	.04
—.21	—.25	—.17	—.17	.04	.04
—.08	.01	.10	—.05	—.15	—.17
.01	—.12	—.07	—.08	.41(.44)	.26
—.01	—.03	—.04	—.03	—.10	—.15(—.14)
.13	.02	.04	.11	—.06	.00
.04	.07	—.01	—.08	.12	—.02
—.24	—.18	—.09	—.15	—.35(—.35)	—.41(—.41)
—.14	—.11	—.24	—.19	—.28	—.36(—.44)
—.06	—.09	.05	—.04	.00	.04
—.20	—.19	—.08	—.15	—.04	—.08
—.12	—.24	.03	.03	—.24(—.31)	—.13
.08	.08	.29	—.05	.13	.32(.32)
.16	.13	.20	.11	.31(.34)	.30(.39)
—.09	—.10	—.09	—.08	.09	.01
.00	.00	—.01	.03	—.07	—.11
—.16	—.14	—.16	—.17	.18	.15
—.26	—.13	—.14	—.09	.00	.00
.01	—.21	—.10	—.15	.26	.05
.04	—.03	.06	.02	—.17(—.17)	—.12
.07	—.03	.04	.08	—.05	.05
—.03	—.18	.05	—.02	—.27(—.29)	—.20
.09	.09	.16	.02	—.27	—.20
.00	.11	—.04	—.01	.07	—.05

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Avoidance (Direct) of Inner Life			
Total Sample	.15(.15)	.13	.15(.15)
Large City	.16	.09	.15
Medium City	.21	.22	.20
Small City	.12	.17	.18
Consolidated District	.04	.02	.05
Avoidance (Indirect) of Inner Life			
Total Sample	—.07	—.07	—.07
Large City	—.17	—.20	—.19
Medium City	.12	.12	.14
Small City	.09	.14	.13
Consolidated District	—.39(—.38)	—.41(—.40)	—.42(—.40)

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Organizational Value

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
.18(.18)	.17(.17)	.10	.10	—.03	—.02
.14	.22	.07	.14	—.08	.03
.25	.26	.14	.09	—.07	—.03
.14	.01	.05	.06	.18	.10
.13	.12	.09	.07	—.12	—.11
—.05	—.05	—.05	—.01	—.04	.04
—.21	—.25(—.11)	—.20	—.23	.10	.13
.24	.26	.27(.27)	.27(.27)	—.11	—.11
.17	.00	—.02	.11	.08	.18
—.36(—.35)	—.23	—.33(—.30)	—.21	—.19	—.12

Organizational Reward

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

Table 22: Mean Values for Inner Life Cathexis Measures in Total Sample and in Each District

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Item Score	3.36	3.32	3.48	2.73	3.98	1.37	....
Rare Score	.23	.30	.21	.10	.29	.58	....
Thought	1.29	1.38	1.38	.78	1.60	1.78	....
Positive Emotion	1.72	1.43	1.79	1.66	2.23	1.28	....
Negative Emotion	—1.98	—1.71	—2.00	—2.12	—2.29	1.29	....
Approach (Direct) to Inner Life	3.85	3.90	3.92	3.51	4.06	1.22	....
Approach (Indirect) to Inner Life	1.48	1.33	1.56	1.46	1.63	.65	....
Avoidance (Direct) of Inner Life	.68	.59	.81	.71	.60	.84	....
Avoidance (Indirect) of Inner Life	1.29	1.30	1.19	1.54	1.11	2.07	....

The most consistent findings, and the highest correlations obtained with the Inner Life Cathexis measures, emerge in Consolidated District. When the Performance and Attitude Scores are broken down, even more striking relationships emerge. While all six rating items yield correlations above .30, the Performance in Relation to Community variable (item 2) produces a value of —.48 (—.51) and the Effect on Attitudes in the Community variable (item 5) produces a value of —.43 (—.45). Evidently, avoiding emotion and thought is looked upon rather negatively in this district, especially when it concerns community relationships.

On the reward side, the total sample data yield some evidence that a positive cathexis of inner life, particularly of pleasant emotion, tends to be penalized among school administrators. Although the correlations are neither high nor consistent across criteria, they do receive some support in the individual districts. Thus, in Small City a rather sizeable negative relationship between pleasant emotion and reward is apparent, and a positive relationship is present where unpleasant emotion is concerned. In Consolidated District the pattern is essentially the same, but thought in addition to negative emotion tends to be rewarded. Here there is some evidence of a reward structure reinforcing a value structure, although the negative correlation with pleasant emotion is inconsistent.

Rather surprisingly the findings in Medium City are just the reverse of those in Small City and Consolidated District. In the latter two districts unpleasant emotion is rewarded; in Medium City the opposite occurs, the correlation is negative. And as a consequence of this, positive cathexis of inner life generally yields a negative correlation also. Clearly, the various districts are not entirely consistent in the way they reward various types of emotion.

Chapter 10

Conformity

With regard to conformity, as with the other personality characteristics, inter-district differences are minimal. Consolidated District does consistently have the highest mean scores, but significance is not attained; nor even approached (Table 23).

Table 23: Mean Values for Conformity Measures in Total Sample and in Each District

	Total Sample	Large City	Medium City	Small City	Consolidated District	F	P
Average Frequency of Responses							
In United States	35.7	35.4	35.3	36.0	36.3	.61	....
Among School Administrators	41.1	40.7	40.7	41.3	42.2	.69	....
Adherence to Social Norms							
United States Norms	6.5	6.4	6.5	6.5	6.5	.02	....
School Administrator Norms	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.4	9.6	.08	....

Table 24: Correlations Between Conformity Measures and Indexes of Organizational Value

	Performance Score	Attitude Score	Composite Score
Average Frequency of Responses in United States			
Total Sample	—.06	—.05	—.06
Large City	.09	.17	.10
Medium City	—.09	—.18	—.11
Small City	—.21	—.19	—.23
Consolidated District	—.14	—.13	—.16
Among School Administrators			
Total Sample	—.02	—.01	—.02
Large City	.06	.15	.09
Medium City	—.05	—.15	—.07
Small City	—.24	—.17	—.24
Consolidated City	.10	.08	.06
Adherence to Social Norms			
United States Norms			
Total Sample	—.07	—.07	—.08
Large City	.06	.15	.09
Medium City	.04	—.02	.03
Small City	—.39(—.43)	—.40(—.42)	—.42(—.45)
Consolidated District	—.18	—.22	—.21
School Administrator Norms			
Total Sample	.02	.02	.01
Large City	.10	.19	.12
Medium City	.03	—.09	.00
Small City	—.26	—.24	—.30(—.30)
Consolidated City	.18	.18	.16

Numbers in parentheses indicate correlations with age partialed out.

Organizational Value

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

				Organizational Reward	
Overall Evaluation	Potential	Creativity	Innovation	Grade Level	Salary
—.04	—.05	—.11	—.09	.05	.05
.13	.09	—.03	.01	.09	.06
—.14	—.16	—.15	—.09	.14	.05
—.08	—.02	—.15	—.18	—.11	—.15
—.21	—.23	—.21	—.19	.10	.23
.02	.02	—.07	—.06	.05	.03
.11	.08	—.01	.02	.00	—.06
—.03	—.07	—.16	—.13	.17	.09
—.09	.01	—.13	—.15	—.03	—.09
.07	.06	.02	.01	.06	.26
—.07	.01	—.09	—.09	.09	.06
.08	.08	.01	.03	.05	.00
—.02	.08	—.06	—.01	.21	.12
—.29(—.31)	—.11	—.24	—.31(—.38)	.09	.09
—.19	—.15	—.22	—.21	—.09	.05
.03	.07	—.01	—.05	.08	.05
.12	.10	.01	.02	.12	.06
—.01	.02	.00	—.11	.09	—.03
—.17	.02	—.12	—.18	.01	.05
.13	.13	.06	.06	.07	.22

Organizational Reward

Total Sample	*Large City*	*Medium City*	*Small City*	*Consolidated District*
P .05=.14	P .05=.24	P .05=.27	P .05=.30	P .05=.33
P .01=.19	P .01=.31	P .01=.35	P .01=.39	P .01=.42

Certain comparison data are presented in Table 25. The bank managers represent approximately two-thirds of the management group of a large bank in the Northwest (Miner, 1965). The corporate officers are drawn from a variety of industries having headquarters in the Northeast. All are at the vice-presidential level or above, with over half being presidents of their companies. The university professors came primarily from the liberal arts departments of schools located in the Northeast. Most are full professors (Miner, 1962). The college graduates derive from the representative sample of the U. S. population discussed previously (Tomkins and Miner, 1957). They represent all of the employed males holding college degrees in the sample.

Table 25: Mean Values for Conformity Measures in Total Sample of School Administrators and in Various Comparison Groups

Group	N	Average Frequency of Responses		Adherence to Social Norms	
		U.S.	Group	U.S.	Group
School Administrators	219	35.7	41.1	6.5	9.5
Bank Managers	105	36.8	44.8	6.8	11.0
Corporate Officers	44	35.0	41.1	6.0	9.9
University Professors	41	34.9	40.5	5.9	7.6
Employed College Graduates	43	37.1	44.5	6.8	9.6

The overall trend of the comparisons suggests that school administrators are neither particularly conforming nor particularly deviant. They tend to score below the bank managers and the college graduates; above the corporate officers and university professors. But these findings should be interpreted in the light of what is known about the relationship between age and conformity. Over the age range represented here the correlation between these two variables in the population is —.40 (Miner, 1965). The corporate officers and professors average about 53 years of age, some seven years older than the school administrators. Thus, one might expect them to score a little lower on the conformity measures. The college graduates average about 38, eight years younger than the school administrators, so that their somewhat greater conformity is not unexpected either. On the other hand, the bank managers average approximately four years older than the school administrators, and yet have higher scores. If anything, therefore, the school administrators would tend in the direction of nonconformity.

However, there is reason to believe that the bank group as a whole is unusually conforming.

In the total sample there is no evidence of any relationship between the various conformity measures and indexes of organizational value (Table 24, pages 64-65). Nor do Large City, Medium City, or Consolidated District produce any significant results. Yet the correlations in Small City achieve rather sizeable proportions, and they occur across a number of rating variables. In this one instance a tendency toward nonconformity is clearly valued.

As Table 24 indicates, none of the districts, including Small City, tends to reward either conformity or nonconformity.

PART 3

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTER

Chapter 11

Large City

Perhaps the most striking thing about the results presented in Part 2 is the sparseness of significant findings which replicate across districts. Yet there is no lack of significant correlations, many of them in the high 30s and 40s. These relationships tend, however, to emerge in one district only, or at most two.

Under these circumstances it becomes meaningful to shift the focus of the research away from the search for broad generalizations, which may be applied to school administration generally, to a more clinical approach. One may use the data collected to analyze the administrative component of each district, to determine what the basic dynamics are in the sense of an organizational character. Such analyses are not intended as a basis for generalization, although they may eventually generate typologies. The approach is similar to that a clinical psychologist takes with an individual—but the subject is not a single person; it is the whole top layer of an organization.

In carrying out such studies of organizational character one need not of course rely upon statistical significance levels of the kind used when generalization to successive samples drawn from the same population is intended. The population is the district's administration at a given point in time. Yet for the present purposes, where some method of identifying correlations which are large enough to be meaningful is needed, it seems appropriate to retain the .05 level as a cutting point.

Although statistical significance is not a *sine qua non* for such clinical studies of organizational character, complete coverage of the relevant organizational population is. This condition has been met in the current research. In three of the four districts 90 per cent or more of the administrators were included; the average for the three is 94.3 per cent. In Large City the proportion is lower, yet the group tested does appear to be representative in terms of level in the hierarchy and in other respects, and well over 50 per cent of the administrators are included.

Turning now to the Large City findings, the picture which appears is strikingly similar in many ways to what seems to typify many large business firms. For one thing the ratings given by the top level administrators tend to run low, in comparison with the other districts. This may reflect a low caliber of personnel, but this seems unlikely. The pay is good and the general level of intelligence is high. A more probable interpretation is that in Large City the administrators at the top are able to maintain more distance and more objectivity. This may be largely a function of size *per se*. They become less personally involved with their subordinates and therefore are less likely to overvalue them. On the average they rate the group as a whole as Good. The impression gained, and this is supported by other findings, is of a just but impersonal system.

The most striking parallel with large business organizations emerges from the managerial motivation indexes. There is a consistent and strong tendency to value individuals who want to meet managerial type role requirements. The correlations run up to .42. Involved in this is a willingness to accept the responsibilities of leadership, to stand out from the group, and to assume a masculine role. To a degree at least, avoiding the rebelliousness against higher authority that tends to be associated with youth and immaturity is important also. Coupled with this value placed on assuming mature responsibility is a similar stress on competitiveness and achievement striving. Correlations between individual rating items and masculinity go up to .43; with competitiveness as high as .36. Probably the negative correlation between Performance Score and Negative Emotion reflects much the same thing. A resort to anxiety and depression is condemned. Becoming anxious and depressed is presumably a sign of weakness and is associated with a failure to accept the responsibilities of the job (Negative Emotion is correlated —.27 with the MSCS Item Score and —.32 with the Standing Out from Group subscale in this district).

Large City emerges then as a district where the going is often rough; where maturity, independence, and a persistent desire to achieve are highly valued. One might expect that a measure of "ego strength" would prove a good predictor here. Yet power motivation in and of itself is not valued. Probably power is of little significance in such a situation because the available sanctions are few in number and difficult to employ.

In spite of this clear picture insofar as value structure is concerned, the managerial motivation scores in Large City are not particularly high. Thus, there is no evidence that the district has attracted and retained the kind of people it values any more than the other districts. One reason would appear to be the minimal reward for such behavior. A partial correlation between Salary and MSCS Item Score of .29 does emerge, but the comparable grade level correlation is .19, and significance is only attained with the age-corrected data. None of the subscales which are valid predictors of the ratings emerges as significant against reward criteria.

These relationships involving managerial motivation must be compared to those involving age. Youth is apparently *valued*, the correlations go up to —.55, but age is *rewarded* to an almost identical extent. Thus, many individuals who are considered the least effective are constantly visible in the higher level positions, and they receive the highest salaries. Under such circumstances, where merely putting in time is so important as a basis for reward, many young administrators with strong managerial motivation may well leave for other districts where they believe the grass to be greener. True, individuals with managerial motivation do tend to be paid more, relative to others of their own age, but in the context of the total administrative group managerial motivation receives only limited reinforcement.

This contrasts with verbal ability, which does not appear to be valued to any significant degree, but which is rewarded. The people in higher positions do tend to be more intelligent and the better salaries go to the more intelligent also. Under these circumstances a relatively high level of ability is maintained. This is the type of finding, like that obtained with the managerial motivation measure, which tends to typify large industrial organizations.

It is interesting to note that the kind of people who work in administrative positions in Large City are not particularly mobile individuals. Job changing is not frequent. Most have spent a relatively long time in each position. And there is no particular tendency for in-district or out-district job change to be characteristic.

Overall, the district emerges as one which attracts and retains intelligent, stable administrators through the effective use of monetary rewards. Such factors as youth, personal maturity, competitiveness, freedom from anxiety, responsible leadership, and masculine example are highly valued. Yet the reward structure does not do as much as it might to reinforce the value structure. Age is the major basis for reward and intelligence is the secondary basis. Evaluation of performance is carried out in an objective and rather impersonal manner, but it is unrelated to reward. Under such circumstances the young, ambitious administrator with a desire to assume managerial responsibilities may become disillusioned. The inflexibilities of the bureaucratic structure may produce in him a continuing state of conflict. Thus, what is in many respects a very effective, although impersonal organization, fails to achieve its total potential in terms of goal attainment because of a limited ability to adapt the reward structures to its ends.

Chapter 12

Medium City

Medium City comes as close to rewarding those characteristics it values as any of the districts, although even here there are some striking exceptions. There is a definite tendency to assign higher grade levels to those who are considered superior administrators. On the other hand, creativity and innovative tendencies are not rewarded. Overall, the impression one gains is that competence as an administrator may well elicit reward in one form or other, but originality of thought or action is much less likely to do so. Actually, Creativity and Innovation are not as highly correlated with the other value indexes in this district. The coefficients are consistently in the .50s, a good .10 below the total sample figures.

Under these circumstances youth does emerge as valued, but not nearly to the same extent it does in some of the other districts, and it seems to be more closely associated with Creativity and Innovation than with the other rating variables. Age is once again rewarded, in the case of salary to a rather high degree (.53).

Nevertheless, there are variables which yield more consistency between value and reward. The Rare Score for Work Motivation, Work Motivation Where Passivity is Possible, and Work Motivation Where Distractions are Present all have sizeable positive correlations with organizational value indexes, up to .34, and all are correlated with each other, in the range .38 to .52. The core element here appears to be a compulsive, super-ego driven need to work. What is valued is a tendency to be pulled away from work by a variety of distractions, only to force oneself back to the job in order to overcome the guilt produced by the temptation. There is a lack of freedom and flexibility in this personality syndrome which is often antithetical to creativity and innovation. It is not surprising that a district which values these qualities should fail to reward original ideas and actions.

Although the reward structure does not appear to operate with reference to the exact characteristics that are valued, it does come very close to doing so. Avoidance of work, the desire to get away from work and devote little time or effort to it, tends to be penalized. The correlations run to —.33. A high score on this avoidance variable goes with a low score on the three work variables that are valued, with the correlations all clustering around —.50. Thus, low levels of work motivation are both condemned and unrewarded.

Much the same pattern emerges in the case of the inner life variables. Inner life generally is condemned, especially thought and unpleasant emotion. The correlation is —.32. Similarly, avoidance of inner life is valued. The two measures used, Inner Life Item Score and Indirect Avoidance of Inner Life, are closely related (—.62). Apparently this is a district which has little patience with free emotional expression and thought. Actually, the thought indexes of the Picture Arrangement Test stress aggressive fantasy and escape from work to a considerable degree, so that the findings in this area may be interpreted as additional evidence for the existence of strictures against emotional freedom and laziness.

On the reward side negative emotion is penalized as is a general positive attraction to inner life. These two variables correlate with each other .44 and yield a top validity coefficient against reward indexes of —.31. Thus, some kinds of emotional expression, anxiety and depression, fail to elicit reward in addition to being condemned.

As might be anticipated, the findings in the work area are not entirely independent of those involving inner life. The person in this district who is a compulsive worker tends also to be the one who keeps his emotion rigidly under control and minimizes emotional expression (the correlation is —.45). Both these personality characteristics are of course valued in Medium City.

In addition to these patterns involving work motivation and inner life cathexis, there are several other variables which produce significant correlations—all in relation to value indexes. These variables tend to be largely independent of each other. Avoiding social interaction is condemned, with the correlations rising as high as —.35. Inspection of the overall pattern of relationships in this area suggests that it is a sociophobic reaction, or a lack of sociability in relation to superiors that is primarily involved. This interpretation corresponds with the fact that a favorable attitude toward authority figures as reflected in the MSCS responses is also valued, the top correlation being .32.

There is in all this a strong vertical emphasis. The top level administrators in the district value people who do not avoid them, who express favorable feelings toward them, or at least do not appear negative and rebellious. In a sense this same concern is apparent in the stress on emotional control and compulsive work. The man who is considered outstanding is the one who presents no problems, who forces himself to work without making demands on his superiors and who therefore does not bother anyone. Something of this same quality appears to be reflected in the masculinity findings obtained with the Miner Sentence Completion Scale, where correlations with individual rating items rise to .40. The Masculine Role subscale correlates .27 with the Rare Score for Work Motivation in this district.

One might expect in an organization with this type of value structure, where "troublemakers" are particularly likely to be condemned and deprived of rewards, that the administrative staff would contain individuals who have been minimally mobile. Yet this is the district with a particularly large number of individuals who have moved from place to place. The answer to this apparent inconsistency probably derives from a factor which is quite unrelated to the personality make-up of the group. Medium City happens to be located near several institutions of higher learning. It is thus in an ideal position to draw upon individuals who have continued or are continuing their education, and who have left other districts to do so. It is probably this factor also which permits Medium City to attract and retain a relatively intelligent group of administrators with a pay scale which is certainly on the low side.

Chapter 13

Small City

In contrast to Medium City, Small City represents an extreme instance of disparity between value and reward structures. The general trend of the relationships between the two types of indexes is consistently negative, and in one case significance is achieved with a correlation of —.41. A look at the findings obtained with the various personality measures reinforces this impression of disparity. Certainly the administrator who is valued in Small City is very different in a number of respects from the one who is rewarded.

Let us look at the value structure first. One thing that requires discussion at the outset is the very high level of the ratings. On the average the administrators of Small City are rated just short of Outstanding—. Overall they are .7 of an interval above the next highest district which averages at about the Good+ point. It is difficult to say with certainty whether these evaluations are entirely justified or not, but one cannot help suspecting some bias. The pay level is good in Small City and thus should attract competent administrators. Yet it is no better than in Large City where the ratings run 1.6 lower. Also, the average verbal ability score is on the low side, reliably below both Large City and Medium City. All this suggests that the administrators at the top of the hierarchy who made the ratings may well have had a strong personal liking for their subordinates, especially those with the personality characteristics found to correlate highly with the ratings. This liking may permeate the performance evaluation process to the point where the work of a number of individuals is overvalued. At the same time there is a suggestion of cohesiveness within the administration component here which may well contribute to organizational effectiveness, as well as provide a degree of mutual protection.

What are these characteristics that are so highly valued? One of them is work motivation. The correlations are consistent over a number of rating variables and rise to .46. Work in the presence of problem situations is particularly valued.

This tendency to stress problem-solving is congruent with two other sets of findings. For one thing intelligence, in spite of the low scores in the district, is valued. In fact the correlation with Creativity goes to .59. Secondly, nonconformity is valued. The correlations, primarily involving the Adherence to U.S. Norms measure, run as high as —.45.

Conformity is clearly condemned; it is the more deviant individual who is viewed as outstanding. In a context of stress on work motivation and problem-solving, the finding with regard to conformity suggests that originality of thought is important in this district. Actually, the Work Motivation Item Score correlates —.32 with Adherence to U. S. Norms. The hard workers and the nonconformists do tend to be the same people. This general concern with new solutions to problems is also reflected in the very high average ratings given on the Creativity and Innovation measures, in both cases at least 1.0 above the next highest district. The top administrators view those at lower levels as particularly outstanding in these areas.

The picture of a close-knit district where hard work, problem solving, originality, and ambition are valued receives support from certain other findings. A favorable attitude toward those in authority is valued, with the correlations going as high as .42, but this does not mean conformity. In fact, the relationship between the two variables is reflected in a coefficient of —.40. Rather the significance assigned to positive feelings toward authority figures seems to be an aspect of the general value on cohesiveness. Yet this concern does not operate in a restrictive sense. As noted, nonconformity is highly valued. So is competitive striving as measured by the MSCS. In the latter instance reliable correlations are consistently obtained with different rating variables, the highest figure being .29. It is considered good to compete.

Small City emerges from this analysis as a dynamic district with a value structure which seems ideally suited to high levels of organizational effectiveness. The correlations involving age also suggest that the antithesis which plagues the other districts has been resolved here. There is some tendency to value youth, but only in the case of the Potential and Innovation ratings, where such a result seems inevitable, do the correlations achieve anything beyond marginal significance. Furthermore, and this is rather unusual, there is no evidence that age is rewarded. The correlations are very close to zero. Thus, such biases in favor of one age group or another as do exist do not run into direct conflict with the reward structure.

Yet, and one cannot help feeling this is unfortunate, such a value-reward conflict does exist in nearly every other respect. The most striking instance is work motivation where the very measure, Item Score, which produces correlations with value indexes up to .46, also produces negative correlations with reward indexes running as high as —.35. It is the desire to avoid work which is actually rewarded. This is true both in terms of grade level and salary.

In addition, approach motivation insofar as social interaction is concerned is consistently unrewarded. In fact, the whole pattern of correlations suggests that a desire for social relationships is unlikely to yield either a high status position or much money in Small City. The coefficients run up to —.35 with the negative emphasis particularly strong in the case of Close Proximity and Emotional Support. It is clearly that kind of social interaction which involves either physical contact or strongly dependent relationships that goes unrewarded most consistently.

This anti-social emphasis is combined with a strong negative pressure where expression of positive emotion is concerned. The correlations go as high as —.41. And negative emotion, depression and anxiety, is rewarded. The correlation between the positive and negative indexes in the area of emotion is —.42, so it would seem that the reward structure tends, to a degree, to focus on one at the expense of the other. But the negative onus on happiness is most pronounced.

Finally, although this is a rather stable district in the sense that the administrative group has done relatively little job changing, either across districts or within, job changing does tend to be rewarded, particularly changes within a given district. There is then something of an in-district bias here which fits more with what is known about the stress on cohesiveness and the tendency to overvalue group members than with the rest of the reward structure.

In general, however, the pattern of rewards serve to penalize hard work and social interaction, in particular social relationships that are highly supportive or involve close physical proximity. The latter without doubt includes relationships that are primarily sexual in nature. This, combined with the negative onus on pleasure and the positive reward for unhappiness, suggests a generally restrictive structure which tends to heavily penalize freedom of emotional expression. The kind of person who is rewarded here is an unhappy individual who desires to escape both from work and from people. This in contrast to a value system which stresses hard work, ambition, originality, and to some degree youth.

There is much in the Small City situation which suggests a district in transition. It looks very much as if a new value structure has been superimposed on an old system. The reward structure, however, has to date remained resistent to change, although it may eventually follow the new values. At present it would appear that the stress imposed by the disparities thus created is considerable. Whether, however, this is a true interpretation of the historical sequence of events must remain a matter for speculation. Answers to questions of this kind require replicated studies over a time span of several years.

Chapter 14

Consolidated District

Perhaps because it has a somewhat younger group of administrators than the others, Consolidated District does not have a very high relative pay level. Yet within the district age is rewarded, with higher level positions and larger salaries, as it is in most organizations. The age-reward correlations go to .41. And once again youth is valued, in this instance to a very high degree, with the highest correlation being —.63. The relatively low age level has not produced one of the most intelligent groups, however, as one might have anticipated. The average verbal ability score is well below those for Large and Medium City.

In terms of its value structure Consolidated District emerges with one outstanding characteristic. Social interaction with authority figures is strongly valued. The correlations are consistently significant over a number of rating variables and go as high as .46 on an individual item basis. Along with this there is a general stress on avoiding work, or at least minimizing the amount of time devoted to it. Work Where Passivity is Possible and Indirect Approach to Work are condemned. Direct Avoidance of Work is highly praised. The significant correlations involving these three variables are all with Creativity, but they go as high as .40 and the general trend of the correlations with other rating measures is in the same direction. Thus, it seems appropriate to conclude that work motivation is not considered a very desirable characteristic in Consolidated District.

The value picture which emerges suggests that the outstanding administrator is the one who spends his time in interaction with his superiors rather than devoting his energies to independent work effort. Furthermore, it is important not to avoid inner life. The person who shuns emotional expression, who rapidly suppresses his feelings so that they rarely become manifest, is condemned. The correlations in this instance are particularly high. The top value for a single rating item is —.51. Thus, free and frequent social contact with superiors is good. Being emotionally withdrawn and working hard are bad. Presumably work is condemned because it tends to take time away from social interaction; inhibition of emotion and thought is condemned because it makes for cold and distant, perhaps even stilted social relationships with superiors.

In certain respects this stress on spending time with those at the top of the administrative hierarchy, and thus with those who make the evaluations, extends into the reward structure as well. At least certain characteristics which might tend to interfere with continuing superior-subordinate interaction do go unrewarded. For instance, Social Interaction in a Group Situation is negatively correlated with salary level. Direct Avoidance of Social Interaction is positively correlated (.39). Since these two variables are closely related (—.69) in this district, it seems apparent that avoidance in this instance means in large part avoiding socializing with the peer group. In essence, the reward system indicates that the payoff for spending time with friends at the same level will be at a punitively low level. It seems quite possible that rewards operate in this manner largely because peer group interaction can well be antithetical to interaction with authority figures.

Another characteristic that is penalized to some degree is Work Where Distractions are Present. This is compulsive, super-ego driven work motivation which is directed at overcoming all distractions and temptations whether in the form of social interaction, emotion or even injury. The correlation here is —.37. This variable is interrelated with the three work measures which produced significant correlations with the value indexes, the coefficients being in the .40s and .50s. It is also related to Direct Avoidance of Inner Life (.61). Thus, when compulsive work motivation is penalized this tends to reinforce the value structure. Behavior which might conflict with continuing social relationships between superior and subordinate is at least in a relative sense punished.

Finally, thought and negative emotion are positively rewarded. This again is consistent with the tendency to condemn the avoidance of inner life. Direct Avoidance of Inner Life and Thought are clearly negatively related in the district. The coefficient is —.49. Thus, in rewarding thought the organization tends to reinforce its negative evaluation of any inhibition on inner life and feeling.

In view of the fact that two of the three inner life subscales yield positive correlations with the reward indexes, up to .44, it seems surprising that the third subscale produces a significant negative relationship. This situation appears to stem at least in part from the antithesis between positive and negative emotion. The correlation is —.57 in Consolidated District. Furthermore, positive emotion is closely associated with approach motivation in the work area, also with correlations in the .50s. Thus, when work motivation is penalized and negative emotion rewarded, positive emotion tends to be penalized also, almost as a by-product. In view of this situation it would appear inappropriate to make a great deal of this one negative relationship in the inner life vs. reward context. In an overall sense inner life appears to be largely positively reinforced. Emotional withdrawal and inhibition are not only considered bad in the district, they are in a way punished as well.

To these findings one additional piece of information can be added. The administrators of Consolidated District are an occupationally mobile group, although not necessarily as a result of moving from district to district. Many are young men who have been promoted within Consolidated District itself. On the other hand, the out-district changers are the ones who have received the greatest rewards, especially in the form of salary. And among the administrators of this district Out-District Changes per Year correlates .46 with Social Interaction in the Non-Work Situation. The data suggest, therefore, that the administrators who have moved around considerably, and who in Consolidated District are the best rewarded, may obtain access to their new opportunities through the off-the-job social relationships to which they devote a considerable proportion of their time.

The overall impression is of a district which is far from work oriented and which places considerable stress on social considerations. Yet peer group interaction goes largely unrewarded; it is upward interaction that is important. The people at the top like subordinates who pay attention to them, and are not emotionally withdrawn and cold. The man who devotes himself to his work and avoids letting his feelings become manifest is not valued very highly. In general, the reward structure tends to reinforce this pattern. In this context what has been termed managerial motivation seems to make very little difference. The major concern here is not with effective managing and organizational achievement, but with matters of a much different nature.

PART 4

GUIDELINES FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

Chapter 15

The Selection and Training of School Administrators

An original goal of this research was to identify characteristics that might be used in establishing selection systems for administrative positions in school districts. It was anticipated that the concurrent model used would be supplemented with a predictive study should the results indicate that this was warranted. Since the concurrent approach is considerably more economical, even though less precise in its application to the selection problem, it seemed appropriate to initiate the research on this basis.

The original feeling was that if significant relationships could be established in the total sample, and these findings replicated in a number of the very diverse districts selected for study, a significant beginning on the problem of identifying potentially successful school administrators would have been made. The selection instruments thus validated might be used to pick individuals for participation in the administrative curriculums of schools of education, to identify potentially successful administrators for hiring by school districts, and to aid in the internal processes of promotion.

The results of the study, insofar as this particular goal of developing selection procedures is concerned, are somewhat below expectations. At best, it can be said that this aspect of the research achieved a partial success. This outcome essentially parallels those obtained by other investigators. Halpin (1959), for instance, had only limited success in predicting the effectiveness of a group of superintendents. In a study focused at the elementary principal level Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen (1962) ran into similar difficulties. This is not to say that significant validity coefficients have not been obtained; but, as with the present study, they have been relatively few in number and often not sufficiently high to be of much practical value. Furthermore, prior studies have not attempted replication on additional samples.

In certain respects the most striking finding of the research is the stress on youth. The correlations between age and ratings are consistently negative, in the total sample and in each of the four districts. This is rather surprising in view of the relatively restricted age range. No one is under 30 and only 5 per cent of the administrators are in their 60s. A similar relationship involving age has been noted in a study of 105 superintendents, however (Gross, 1958).

Yet equally high correlations are obtained in the reverse direction when salary and grade level are used as criteria. This is true for the total sample and in three of the four districts. It is not, of course, surprising to find rewards distributed on the basis of age or seniority in organizations of various kinds, but this tendency does pose a dilemma insofar as the selection process is concerned: should the young or the old be given administrative responsibility?

In view of the nature and diversity of the rating variables employed there does seem to be a legitimate argument in favor of using these value indexes as the primary criteria in selection. All are clearly relevant to the job and they reflect the current evaluation process as it operates from the top down in each organization. Thus, a stress on youth in connection with the selection of school administrators does seem appropriate under the conditions currently existing in the field of education.

A second finding involves verbal ability. In the total sample significant positive correlations are obtained with the Overall Evaluation, Potential, Creativity, and Innovation ratings. Although only one individual district exhibits the same result, and another achieves significance with the reward criteria, the overall trend of the data would suggest that measures of this kind can profitably be used for selection. The correlations are very low, but on the other hand the group is already highly selected in terms of intelligence. Approximately 95 per cent of the administrators score above the average for the U. S. population. In a sample with less restriction of range the validity coeffcients would be considerably higher. Thus, it seems appropriate to recommend, on the basis of the data, that a minimum cut-off score on some measure of general intelligence or verbal ability be used in selecting individuals for positions in educational administration.

A third finding emerges from the work with the Miner Sentence Completion Scale. The evidence from this study, as well as analyses of scores obtained by graduate students in the field of education (Miner, in press), indicates that managerial motivation is not likely to be rewarded in educational organizations. But it is valued, and unlike the situation involving age, the correlations with reward criteria are very close to zero. The reversal that occurs with age is not present. Thus, there appears to be some argument in favor of using a managerial motivation index in connection with the selection process.

The actual validity coefficients on which this conclusion is based are not large, however. In the total sample, correlations in the .20s appear on all of the rating variables but Creativity and Innovation. Six of the nine measures derived from the MSCS yield significant findings. Only one of the individual districts produces conclusive support for the total sample data insofar as overall scores are concerned, but in all cases positive trends are clearly present. In three of the four districts at least two subscales prove valid and in the fourth coefficients in the .20s are not uncommon, even though significance is not obtained. Among the subscales Authority Figures achieves significance in the total sample and in three districts. Overall, it seems evident that a measure such as this can be useful in the larger school districts. Elsewhere it should be used if the variables measured are felt to be important.

As a whole the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test analysis does not yield generalizable results. There are hints of significance in the total sample in both the work motivation and inner life areas, but the correlations are low and do not hold up consistently across districts. The data are not such as to support generalization at the present time, although they do offer some potentially valuable hypotheses for future research. Incorporating work motivation, social interaction, inner life cathexes, and conformity measures in selection batteries for school administrators generally cannot be recommended on the basis of the present research. In any given district, of course, such measures might well be included on other grounds. In fact all of these variables have proved to be highly significant in at least one district.

By way of guidelines for occupational selection, then, this research suggests that school districts would do well to select young, intelligent individuals with strong managerial motivation for administrative positions. The measures used here can be assumed to have predictive validity for this purpose. Verbal ability indexes of the kind employed have been found valid repeatedly in other studies, when the predictive model was applied. The Miner Sentence Completion Scale has shown similar predictive validity in other contexts (Miner, 1965). Thus, it does seem appropriate to include indexes of this kind when selecting for administrative positions generally in the field of education. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that the introduction of such a selection system will be maximally beneficial in the larger school districts.

At the outset, when this research was initiated, the writer's allegiance was almost entirely to the occupation based, traditional selection model just described. This model had proved useful in prior studies of business management and there seemed no reason to anticipate that it would be any less useful in the field of school administration. Yet now that the research has been completed, there is ample basis for doubting this initial assumption. The writer's allegiance has clearly been shaken. At least in the area of school administration the organization, rather than the occupation, appears to be the more appropriate unit of analysis. It may well be that this is true in other contexts as well.

The implication of this research program to date seems to be that selection should be carried out primarily in terms of the value and reward structures characterizing a given school district. The man who is successful in one district may well fail in another. Local autonomy and ambiguous goal directives from the society as a whole appear to have yielded so much diversity that studies of occupational groups across districts are less likely to produce meaningful results than studies of organizational groups across occupations. It is the writer's current conviction that the road to successful selection insofar as school administration is concerned requires intensive analysis of individual districts; that administrators should be selected in terms of the known needs of a specific organization.

Such an organization based approach to the selection problem does not, of course, entirely preclude the traditional occupational approach.

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter there do appear to be some factors such as age, intelligence, and managerial motivation which operate at least to some degree in terms of the traditional, occupational model. But a primarily organizational focus does require a shift in the direction of research. The result is that new questions come to occupy a central position. How do organizational reward and value structures evolve in the first place? What factors make for change in these structures? Must innovations in educational practice be synchronized with organizational character in order to win acceptance? How may school districts be classified for purposes of developing selection procedures? Is size, for instance, a crucial determinant of certain aspects of the value and reward structure? What variables, in addition to those identified in this particular investigation, can prove to be significant aspects of organizational character?

Although the findings reported here do seem to have some significance in pointing up new directions for educational research, they also carry implications for training in the field of educational administration. Thus, it would appear to be extremely important that future administrators have a thorough grounding in research and theory related to organizational functioning. As they come to understand the variety of organizational character types that are possible and to recognize that various kinds of value and reward structures can produce entirely unanticipated consequences, their capacity to function perceptively and effectively in the school administrator role should show a considerable increase.

Furthermore, the results obtained from these studies would seem to argue strongly for the training of applied researchers, who are capable of carrying out diagnostic analyses at the organizational level. To the extent a school district can operate with a clear understanding of its own internal processes, it will almost certainly operate more effectively. Applied researchers, who are adequately trained, must be available, however, before such organizational analyses can become a widespread reality. Thus it seems important not only to stress organization theory in the training of administrators, but to accelerate the training of organizational research personnel as well.

Chapter 16

Studies of Organizational Character

A second type of finding emerging from the research, and perhaps the most important, relates not to selection and training, but to the specific procedures used in analyzing organizational character, and to the concept of organizational character itself. It is apparent from the analyses presented in Chapters 11 through 14 that patterns of value and reward can develop in a district, which are far from what is consciously intended. It is a long way from an evaluation of the job behavior of a single individual to the comprehensive patterns of organizational character described here. Yet out of separate statements about the goodness or badness, the effectiveness or ineffectiveness, of individual behavior incidents come overall evaluations of individuals. Consistencies in the behavior of individuals result from their motivational, emotional, and cognitive characteristics. Thus, when we say people who exhibit certain types of behavior patterns are outstanding workers or when we bestow promotions on such people, we are really indicating that positive value or reward is attached to the underlying personality characteristics these people possess. As people with similar personalities and behavior patterns are consistently praised and rewarded, while others are not, a particular type of organizational character structure emerges.

It should be apparent that this process may not be guided by any comprehensive conscious plan. What develops is an amalgam of diverse decisions by many individuals. Many of these decisions are guided by forces within these individuals of which they themselves are not at all aware. Thus, it is very unlikely that the administrators at the top of a district will have a clear picture of the organizational character to which they have contributed at the present time. It would seem to be a rare occasion indeed today when those in charge of an organization actually sit down and decide upon the specific personality characteristics they wish to stress, and then self-consciously move to achieve this desired result. Clearly, from the analysis of the four districts, such patterns do emerge, but they would hardly appear to be the results of planned actions and intentional implementations.

Without question many of the districts have developed major inconsistencies and conflicts in their character structures. Presumably this is the case elsewhere in the world of education as well. Value and reward structures are often inconsistent, if not entirely contradictory.

Personality characteristics are valued or rewarded, which cannot but detract from organizational goal attainment. These built-in disparities continue over long periods of time, influencing the behavior of organizations in many respects without the members actually being aware of the underlying dynamic processes involved. In fact, it would appear to be this very lack of conscious awareness of organizational character which makes planned change so rare and an effective organization so difficult to attain.

It is this problem of awareness that studies of organizational character such as those presented in Part 3 can overcome. By applying a clinical approach to the analysis of organizations, using appropriate measurement techniques, it is possible to describe the character of a particular school district at a point in time. Given this knowledge of existing structures, steps can be taken to introduce change, if this seems appropriate. Reward and value structures can be synchronized. Desired behavior patterns can be reinforced. Steps can be taken to introduce changes so as to produce an organization which is not plagued by inconsistencies and conflicting pressures.

The research does demonstrate, then, that school districts develop very disparate organizational characters, and that these characters can be measured and described. Given these facts, it appears evident that studies of the kind conducted can serve as a basis for innovation. Perhaps they are absolutely essential to real change. Certainly a psychotherapist needs to have some knowledge of his patient's personality make-up as a basis for planning a change effort. An analogous diagnostic or descriptive process at the level of the crucial variables may well be a necessary condition for organizational change as well. Just as salient aspects of his personality are often hidden from an individual's awareness, so apparently are many crucial variables of organizational character hidden from the members.

It is apparent that the studies of organizational character presented here, although useful, are lacking in one important respect. An ideal analysis of this kind would include procedures for identifying key individuals in both formal and informal nets of communication and authority. Personality analyses of these individuals might well go a long way toward explaining why particular value and reward structures have evolved. At the same time potential catalysts and blocks to innovation might be identified. Unfortunately, the value of this approach became apparent only after the opportunity to carry out sociometric analyses in the districts had been lost. Furthermore, the commitment to the districts studied involved an agreement to publish the data only on a composite basis, not in terms of specific individuals. Nevertheless, an approach which integrates individual and organizational levels of analysis would seem potentially valuable. Provided appropriate opportunities become available, future research in the area of organizational character will include this aspect.

In conclusion, it is appropriate, perhaps, to point out a parallel. The Hawthorne studies started out to study the effects of environmental conditions, including illumination, on performance; they ended by stressing human relations, because the data could not be explained in other terms. In the same way, the current research started out in an attempt to establish selection procedures for schools administrators; it ended by stressing *organizational* character, because the data could not be explained in terms of the *occupation* based selection models. It is a matter of conjecture, of course, whether this organizational emphasis will prove as useful in its day and age as the human relations concept did in its. Yet it does appear to open a host of new research possibilities.

REFERENCES

1. Carlson, Richard O. *Adoption of Educational Innovations.* Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.
2. Etzioni, Amitai *Modern Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
3. Gross, Neal *Who Runs Our Schools?* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
4. Halpin, Andrew W. *The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents.* Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959.
5. Hemphill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E., and Frederiksen, Norman *Administrative Performance and Personality.* New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1962.
6. Miner, John B. *Intelligence in the United States.* Springer Publishing Co., 1957.
7. Miner, John B. On the Use of a Short Intelligence Test to Measure General Intelligence, *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1961, Vol. 52, 157-160.
8. Miner, John B. Conformity Among University Professors and Business Executives, *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 1962, Vol. 7, 96-109.
9. Miner, John B. *Scoring Guide for the Miner Sentence Completion Scale.* New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1964.
10. Miner, John B. *Studies in Management Education.* New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1965.
11. Miner, John B. A Statistical Model for the Study of Conformity, in Massarik, F. and Ratoosh, P. (eds.) *Mathematical Explorations in Behavioral Science.* Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and the Dorsey Press, 1965, pp. 95-111.
12. Miner, John B. The Managerial Motivation of School Administrators, *Educational Administration Quarterly,* in press.
13. Thorndike, Robert L. Two Screening Tests of Verbal Intelligence, *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 1942, Vol. 26, 128-135.
14. Thorndike, Robert L. and Gallup, George H. Verbal Intelligence of the American Adult, *Journal of General Psychology,* 1944, Vol. 30, 75-85.

15. Tomkins, Silvan S. and Miner, John B. *Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test*. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1957.
16. Tomkins, Silvan S. and Miner, John B. *PAT Interpretation—Scope and Technique*. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1959.